

219+220

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

1. CRM-M No.42943 of 2020
Date of Decision: 28.01.2021

KRISHAN KUMARPetitioner
Vs
STATE OF HARYANARespondent

2. CRM-M No. 42987 of 2020

KRISHANPetitioner
Vs
STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Ajay Vijarania, Advocate for
Mr. Vijay Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Both the cases have been taken up for hearing through
video conferencing.

Vide this common order, CRM-M Nos.42943 and 42987
of 2020 are being disposed of.

In CRM-M No.42943 of 2020, petitioner seeks grant of
regular bail in case bearing FIR No.602 dated 24.11.2019 and in
CRM-M No.42987 of 2020 petitioner seeks grant of regular bail

under Section in case bearing FIR No.603 dated 24.11.2019 both registered under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 376, 452, 506, 511 IPC and Sections 25 & 54 of the Arms Act at Police Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh. (Challan has been presented under Sections 148, 149, 294, 427, 307, 506 IPC and Sections 25 & 54 of the Arms Act.)

Since both the petitions involve similar controversy, therefore, facts are being culled out from CRM-M No.42943 of 2020.

It is not in dispute that co-accused Naveen @ Radhey and Sonu have been granted concession of regular bail in the following cases:-

- (i) CRM-M No.25067 of 2020 titled '*Naveen @ Radhey vs. State of Haryana*'.
- (ii) CRM-M No.25064 of 2020 titled '*Naveen @ Radhey vs. State of Haryana*'.
- (iii) CRM-M No.41792 of 2020 titled '*Sonu vs. State of Haryana*' and
- (iv) CRM-M No.41795 of 2020 titled '*Sonu vs. State of Haryana*'.

Both the occurrences took place within a span of half

an hour. Composition of accused persons is also the same. For the detailed reasons recorded in CRM-M No.25067 of 2020 titled '*Naveen @ Radhey vs. State of Haryana*', the present cases cannot be segregated, rather is same is found to be at par with the said case.

The factual position of the case could not be disputed by learned State counsel, however he submitted that a *danda* has been recovered from the petitioner. Petitioner is not involved in any other case.

At this stage, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail on parity with the co-accused.

In view of above, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

January 28, 2021
Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No