

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

**Date of Decision: August 08, 2022**

1. **CRM-M-1199-2022**  
**Sanju** **...Petitioner**  
**Versus**  
**State of Haryana** **...Respondent**

2. **CRM-M-13099-2022**  
**Roopak** **...Petitioner**  
**Versus**  
**State of Haryana** **...Respondent**

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

**Present:-** Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner  
in CRM-M-1199-2022.  
  
Mr. Raj Mohan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner  
in CRM-M-13099-2022.  
  
Ms. Geeta Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(Oral)**

These two petitions are filed seeking regular bail in FIR No.187, dated 06.06.2021, under Sections 394 and 34 IPC (Section 201 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Agroha, District Hisar.

As per the case set up, on 05.06.2021, complainant Subhash while coming back from his duty was attacked by three boys with muffled faces. One of accused gave a baton blow. He as dragged in the fields. The accused tried to strangulate him. They snatched the mobile phones, purse, ATM, driving licence and some cash from him. In the supplementary statement, complainant named Sanju, Roopak (petitioners) and Vicky. From Sanju, a wooden stick was recovered. At the instance of Roopak and Vicky, a baton and motorcycle allegedly used in the crime were recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that petitioner Sanju is in custody since 22.08.2021 and petitioner Roopak is in custody since 27.07.2021. His contention is that it is a case of false implication. The recovery made from the petitioners nowhere connects them with the alleged incident. Petitioners are not involved in any other cases.

Learned State counsel opposes the above prayer and submits that the petitioners were specifically named by the complainant.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering that the petitioners were named in a supplementary statement made by the complainant; though the investigation is complete, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take time; the petitioners have no criminal antecedents, they are granted bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petitions are allowed.

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

**August 08, 2022**  
sarita

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

**Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/No**  
**Whether reportable: Yes/No**