

**202/1 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
(through video conferencing)**

CRM-M-17986-2021
Decided on : 19.05.2021

Angrej Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.

This is the first petition under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.199 dated 16.04.2018 registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 307, 323, 324, 447, 506, 511, 120-B of IPC 1860 and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act 1959 at Police Station Shahabad District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is innocent, which is evident from the fact that no injury much less fatal injury has been attributed to him in the crime in question. It has been further submitted that the petitioner was armed with danda and no specific injury has been attributed to him. It has also been contended that the fatal injuries have been attributed to co-accused Kripal Singh and Baghail Singh. The petitioner is in custody since 05.05.2018 and only 23 out of 83 prosecution witnesses cited so far have been examined till date. Hence, there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future. It has also been contended that similarly situated co-accused Parveen Kumar,

Raj Babbar, Randhir Singh and others have since been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner has conceded that though the petitioner was alleged to be armed with danda at the time of crime in question, however, no injury much less fatal injury has been attributed to him. He further concedes that the case of the petitioner is on the same footing as that of co-accused, who have since been extended the concession of bail.

Heard.

In view of the submissions made by learned counsel and the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.05.2018, the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future more so in the wake of outbreak of pandemic Covid-19. Hence, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.05.2021
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No