

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

224

**CRM-M-21684-2021
Date of decision: 28.06.2021**

Ombir

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Vineet Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

The petitioner has filed the present (first) petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.24 dated 02.04.2020 registered under Section 379-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station GRP Jind, District GRP Ambala.

The petitioner being in custody has filed the present petition for grant of regular bail.

The petition has been opposed by the respondent-State. However, no reply has been filed by the respondent-State.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and have gone through the relevant record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the

petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No independent witness was joined at the time of alleged recovery. The story of the prosecution is false and manipulated one. There is no evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of alleged offence. Recovery of amount of Rs.6,000/- was falsely planted on the petitioner. The trial is likely to take long time due to restrictions imposed to prevent spread of Covid-19. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Therefore, the petitioner may be granted regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has submitted that in view of the nature of accusation and gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve grant of regular bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and evidence against the petitioner and the fact that the trial is likely to take long time due to restrictions imposed to prevent the spread of Covid-19, but without commenting on the merits of the case, I am inclined to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, the petitioner is granted regular bail subject to the condition that he shall not commit any similar offence after his release on bail and in case of commission of any such offence by him in

future his bail in the present case shall also be liable to be cancelled on application to be filed by the prosecution in this regard.

28.06.2021

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No