

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

111

**CRM-39678-2021 in CRM-M-15250-2021
Date of Decision: 29.11.2021**

Ashish Khatri @ Bittoo

....Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikas Gulia, Advocate for applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

CRM-39678-2021

This application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for preponing the date of hearing of the main petition, which is already fixed for 19.01.2022.

Notice of application.

At the asking of Court, learned State counsel accepts notice and stated that he has no objection if application is allowed.

In view of the grounds mentioned in the application and no objection by learned State counsel, hearing of the main petition is preponed and is taken on Board today itself.

CRM is allowed.

Main Case

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C has been moved by petitioner-**Ashish Khatri @ Bittoo** for grant of regular bail in case FIR

Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

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 submits that once police party was having specific secret information regarding presence of two persons and that too heavily armed; the fact that raiding party was also heavily armed and the fact that both of them were apprehended on the spot without any exchange of fire; above said circumstance as propounded by Police Agency does not appear to be plausible. He further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 28.11.2020 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 and trial has commenced. 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 28.11.2020; 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-**Ashish Khatri @ Bittoo** 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, Panipat, as the case may be.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

29.11.2021

Varinder Prashad

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No