

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

**(I)**

**CRM-M-29593-2020 (O&M)**

Date of Decision:- 16.3.2021

Karandeep Singh @ KD

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**(II)**

**CRM-M-30076-2020 (O&M)**

Charanjit Singh @ Channi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**(III)**

**CRM-M-2978-2021 (O&M)**

Rajat Dhiman

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate,  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-29593-2020.

Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-30076-2020.

Mr. Rahul Singla, Advocate,  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-2978-2021.

Mr. Imran Ali, Advocate and  
Mr. Raj Sumar Singh, Advocate, for the complainant.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,  
assisted by ASI Rishipal.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. This order shall dispose of the above mentioned two petitions wherein petitioners Karandeep Singh @ KD, Charanjit Singh @ Channi and Rajat Dhiman, seek grant of regular bail in a case registered vide FIR No. 307, dated 9.7.2020, Police Station Farakpur now Gandhi Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar, under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 324, 427, 452, 506 IPC and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Intzar Hussain wherein it is alleged that on 8.7.2020 at about 10.30 pm. when he along with his brother-in-law Julfan was present in his office, then five armed persons entered his office and one of them who was carrying a 'sword' gave a blow towards his head which was warded off by his brother-in-law with his hand. Thereafter when the complainant came out of his office another boy gave a blow with an 'iron rod' on his head. Another 2 boys who were also carrying 'iron rods' attacked him and caused injuries on his back. Another of them gave a blow with 'sword' on his back and one of the boys fired at him with an intention to kill him. The complainant in order to save his life ran

towards a medical store and the said boys followed him and broke the glass of the medical shop.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that they are nowhere named in the FIR and have been subsequently nominated either on the basis of a highly belated supplementary statement recorded by the complainant or on the basis of disclosure statements made by some other co-accused so nominated in the supplementary statement.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that it was pursuant to a supplementary statement of the complainant recorded on 26.7.2020 that one Rohit Mehta and Karandeep came to be nominated and who upon interrogation disclosed the names of the other accused including Charanjit and Rajat. It has further been submitted that a country made pistol had been recovered from Rajat and that while a 'sword' has been recovered from Karandeep, one 'iron rod' was recovered from Charanjit which would substantiate the allegations against the accused. Learned State counsel has further informed that Charanjit stands involved in one more case. It has further been informed that while Karandeep and Rajat had been behind bars since the last more than 7 months, Charanjit has been behind bars since the last more than 6 months.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.

6. It is not disputed that none of the petitioners is named in the FIR and that while Karandeep came to be nominated on the basis of a supplementary statement of complainant recorded after about 20 days of the FIR, the remaining two petitioners namely Charanjit and Rajat came to be nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of the aforesaid Karandeep and one Rohit Mehta. The veracity and admissibility such like disclosure statements would be debatable. In any case since the petitioners have been behind bars since the last about 6-7 months and till date not even a single PW has been examined, further detention of the petitioners will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume substantial time. The petitions, as such, are accepted and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**March 16, 2021**  
mohan

**( GURVINDER SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Whether speaking /reasoned | Yes / No |
| Whether Reportable         | Yes / No |