

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

**107**

**CRM-M-43755-2020.**

**Date of Decision: 17.11.2021.**

Amit Dagar

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

----

**Present:** Mr. Balram Prashar, Advocate for petitioner (through V.C.).

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)**

This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail has been moved by petitioner-**Amit Dagar** in case FIR No.227 dated 26.06.2020 under Sections 120-B, 201 and 302 IPC read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Sohana, District Gurugram.

In compliance of order dated 06.10.2021, status report dated 16.11.2021 has been received from the Trial Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that version, as alleged in the FIR, is totally concocted and there is no iota of truth therein. He further submits that allegedly car make Alto bearing registration No.HR-72-D-5298 owned by petitioner was used in the commission of alleged offence, whereas petitioner has no nexus whatsoever in the commission of alleged offence. He further urges that petitioner was not named in the FIR. He further urges that as a matter of fact petitioner is a

Government employee working on the post of Gram Sachiv in Block Development and Panchayat Office, Indri. He further urges that at the relevant time i.e. on 26.06.2020 at 9:00 AM, petitioner alongwith his colleagues was attending official meeting. He further urges that petitioner is languishing in custody since 27.06.2020 and he is no more required by the Investigating Agency for any investigation purpose as after completion of investigation, final report as envisaged under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court. He further submits that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and he may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing instant petition has vehemently argued that keeping in view seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully gone through the record of the case.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is languishing in custody since 27.06.2020; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation purpose as after completion of investigation final report as envisaged under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court and since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, he deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner-**Amit Dagar** is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Gurugram, as the case may be.

**(LALIT BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**17.11.2021**  
*jitender*

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No