

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(214)

CRM No. M- 49081-2021

Date of Decision : 29.11.2021

Ravi @ Pujari

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

(Through Video Conferencing)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Suneel Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.
(keeping in view advance copy given)

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 73 dated 02.03.2020, registered under Sections 457, 380, 473, 411 IPC at Police Station Sector-14, Panchkula, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that not only the challan has been presented and the charges have been framed but even the informant has also been examined and, therefore, no useful purpose will be achieved in keeping the petitioner behind bars during the entire trial. Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that the petitioner is involved in 11 other cases of the similar in nature but submits that he has been falsely implicated in those as he has been acquitted in number of cases and has been already granted the regular bail in other cases except the present one

and one other case.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Karan Garg, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who has joined the proceedings through video conferencing, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, submits that petitioner is a habitual offender and every time, he is granted bail, he commits the same crime and, therefore, in order to save the general public, the petitioner may not be extended the benefit of regular bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt, petitioner is involved in other cases but he is yet to be proved guilty and rather submits that another chance be given to the petitioner to mend his ways and further submits that petitioner undertakes not to violate law in case, he is extended the benefit of regular bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Keeping in view the fact that in the present case even the informant has been examined after the framing of charges and trial is likely to take some time before the same concludes, no useful purpose will be achieved in keeping the petitioner behind the bars. As far as the pendency of the other cases is concerned, no doubt the same has to be taken into consideration but keeping in view the allegations in those cases and the petitioner is yet to be convicted in those and the petitioner has rather been acquitted in number of other cases and petitioner also prays for another chance to mend his ways, the petitioner is extended the benefit of regular bail in this case.

The petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail in this case subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that petitioner will not influence trial in any manner including influencing the witnesses and in case of default of the above undertaking, State will be at liberty to approach this Court for passing appropriate orders.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

November 29, 2021
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No