

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(209)

CRM No. M-20901-2021

Date of Decision : 29.06.2021

Ravinder @ Golu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

(through video conferencing)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shubhra Singh, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 54, dated 18.03.2020, registered under Sections 379-A, 34 IPC at Police Station Narwana City, District Jind.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegations alleged against the petitioner in the FIR are totally incorrect and false. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Naseeb has already been granted the benefit of regular bail by this Court while deciding CRM No. M-10974 of 2021, on 31.03.2021. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has undergone incarceration for a

period of more than 1 year and 3 months.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Shubhra Singh, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is also facing trial in an another case of a similar nature and, therefore, it is likely that in case he is released on bail, he will again indulge in the illegal activities being habitual offender.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

The petitioner is behind bars for the last 1 year and 3 months and the trial is likely to take some time before the same concludes. The co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Naseeb has already been released on bail by this Court while deciding CRM No. M-10974 of 2021, on 31.03.2021. With regard to the objection of learned State counsel that there is another FIR registered against the petitioner, it is not disputed that the petitioner is already on bail in respect of the said FIR.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in case the petitioner is granted regular bail, he will maintain good conduct and will abide by all the conditions imposed upon him for bail and in case of default of the above undertaking, State will be at liberty to approach this Court for passing appropriate orders.

In view of the above, the petitioner is directed to be released on

regular bail in this case subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

June 29, 2021
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No