

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

**CRM-M-36727 of 2021 (O&M)**

**DECIDED ON: 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2021**

**Vishal @ Vicky**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**State of Haryana**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.**

Present: Mr. Fatehjeet Singh, Advocate for  
Mr. A.K. Dhiman, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)**

This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in case of FIR No.447 dated 8.11.2020, under Sections 307 read with Section 34 IPC, Sections 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and Section 20 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Rohtak Sadar, District Rohtak.

The brief facts are that police party on 8.11.2020 during routine patrolling signalled Scorio vehicle bearing registration No.HR-12-AJ-0494 to stop. The driver of the vehicle tried to run over the vehicle over the checking party. The vehicle was chased, Mandeep and Rahul were apprehended at the spot. As per the allegations Parvesh managed to escape. From the vehicle 28 kg of Ganja was recovered. The petitioner's name surfaced in a disclosure statement made by the co-accused stating that the Ganja was to be supplied to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not apprehended from the spot. No recovery was made. He was named in a disclosure statement. The petitioner is in custody since 22.12.2020, investigation is complete.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that the petitioner was involved in four more cases and he is habitual offender.

The recovery was from the vehicle. Two co-accused were apprehended at the spot. Parvesh who managed to fled from the spot was apprehended. The name of the petitioner came in disclosure statement. No recovery was made. Investigation is complete. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time. Mere involvement in other cases itself would not be a ground to deprive the personal liberty of the petitioner. Bail is granted to the petitioner on furnishing surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

The Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending are rendered infructuous.

**9<sup>th</sup> November, 2021**

*reema*

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned*      *Yes*

*Whether reportable*              *Yes*