

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

CRM-M-42948 of 2020

Date of Decision : October 27, 2021

Pardeep

..... Petitioner

vs

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present : Ms. Monika Tanwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., on behalf of the petitioner, in case FIR No.32, dated 12.02.2019, under Sections 346 and 34 of the IPC (Sections 302, 364, 201, 411, 404 and 120-B of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Baroda, District Sonipat.

(2). The petitioner has remained in detention since 20.06.2020.

(3). It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that there is no material on record to show his involvement in the alleged murder of Vishesh @ Bholu except for the bald allegations in the FIR (Annexure P-1) to the effect that the said deceased had left home along with Rs.15,000/- and gone for shopping at Gohana on 21.01.2019 along with the present petitioner and co-accused Pawan and Satish @ Kuuku and the present petitioner after which he did not return, on account of which the complainant suspected that those three persons, including the present petitioner, have confined his grandson Vishesh @ Bholu in some secret place.

(4). Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has sent up the copies of the statements (through e-mail) made by the prosecution witnesses examined so far in the case, including complainant Rampal himself as PW-1. It is seen that all the three prosecution witnesses examined being Rampal as PW-1, Parvesh as PW-2 and Jagdish as PW-3 had not supported the prosecution case and had been declared hostile.

(5). Co-accused Pawan, Parvesh and Satish @ Kuuku have already been granted concession of regular bail earlier by this Court in CRM-M Nos.32729 of 2020, 17678 of 2020 and 16991 of 2020, respectively, by considering the detention undergone by them and the sketchy nature of material coming on record. The petitioner stands on the similar footing in the present case and he has also remained in custody for a substantial long time.

(6). As such, without commenting any further on the merits of the present case as a whole, but in view of the detention undergone by the petitioner, the prayer of the petitioner for regular bail is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail subject of appropriate terms and conditions to the satisfaction of the Ld. Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

(7). Disposed off.

October 27, 2021

sarita

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No