

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

113+245

**CRM-30987-2021 in/and
CRM-M-12358-2021
Date of Decision:22.09.2021**

Rohit Saini

....Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Bhardwaj, Advocate for applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

CRM-30987-2021

This is an application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for placing on record documents Annexures P/4 and P/5.

Documents (Annexures P/4 and P/5) are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM is allowed.

Main Case

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail has been moved by petitioner-**Rohit Saini** in case FIR No.297 dated 12.08.2020 under Sections 120-B, 384 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Arya Nagar Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that version, as alleged in the FIR, is totally concocted one and there is no iota of truth therein. He further urges that as a matter of fact on account of some monetary transaction between complainant and petitioner, latter has been falsely implicated in the instant case. He further urges that allegedly no extortion was made by the petitioner in conspiracy with co-accused. He further urges that co-accused Naina has already been admitted to bail by Sessions Court, vide order dated 13.10.2020 (Annexure P/5). He further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 12.08.2020 and he is no more required by the Police for any investigation purpose as after completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court. He further urges that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and he may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing instant petition has vehemently argued that keeping in view seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the contents of petition.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is in custody since 12.08.2020; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation

purpose; that *Challan* has already been presented in Court and since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, he deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner-**Rohit Saini** is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Rohtak, as the case may be.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

22.09.2021

Varinder Prashad

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No