

227

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

**(Through video-conferencing)**

**CRM-M No.16142 of 2021(O&M)  
Date of Decision: 16.08.2021**

**Vikram**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

**State of Haryana**

**.....Respondent**

**CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH***

Present: Mr. B.S. Mamli, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)**

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.0235 dated 12.05.2019 registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 323, 341, 427, 506, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

As per allegations in the FIR, 15-20 persons duly armed with bricks and sticks came out in the street in front of vehicle of the complainant party and they encircled the vehicle. The petitioner and Rajender threw bricks on the wind screen of the

vehicle of the complainant. Pankaj @ Ganja fired a gun shot towards the complainant, which also hit on the window pane of the vehicle. Thereafter, Rohit, Sunil @ Kaka, Vishal, Poni, Balraj @ Goli, Sanjay and Machhi started damaging the fortuner car and alto car with their sticks and dandas. 8-10 other persons also started throwing bricks/stones. Complainant party fled away from the spot to save their lives. The reasons for this occurrence was that in the year 2014, Pinki Rati was murdered, in which the complainant and other boys from the community were arrested. Few days back, Prem Rati had threatened the complainant that he had prepared a team for the complainant and they will finish him.

Co-accused Vishal and Balraj @ Goli have been granted regular bail vide orders dated 23.01.2020 and 25.09.2019 passed in CRM-M No.51956 of 2019 and CRM-M No.37685 of 2019 respectively. Co-accused Rohit has also been granted regular bail vide order dated 18.02.2021 passed in CRM-M No.5795 of 2021.

The allegations qua the petitioner are also of damaging the cars of the complainant party.

Learned State counsel, however, opposed the bail on the ground that the petitioner could not be arrested for 2 years and was arrested only on 08.01.2021. Petitioner is also involved

in three cases under Gambling Act and one case under IPC, in which he is on bail.

The complicity of the petitioner would remain debatable. Challan has already been presented. Charges have not been framed qua the petitioner so far as he was arrested later on.

In view of aforesaid facts and without meaning anything on merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

16.08.2021

*Prince*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No