

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

226

CRM-M-4065-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.05.2022

KARAMJEET

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Ms. Alisha Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition second petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.140 dated 16.11.2019, registered at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh, under Sections 302, 201 and 34 IPC, first one having been dismissed as withdrawn on 23.11.2020.

As per the case of the prosecution, Krishan Kumar, Sarpanch of Village Nanwa, informed the police that a dead body had been floating in the pond of village.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; that no weapon was recovered from the petitioner; that the petitioner has been indicted in the present case on the basis of statement of Sandeep Kumar son of Ramesh (deceased) recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.; that the petitioner has been in custody since

19.11.2019 and that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. She further submits that there is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that on 19.11.2019, Sandeep Kumar son of Ramesh (since deceased) got recorded his statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. wherein he specifically stated that on 14.11.2019, his father, namely, Ramesh told him that he was going to meet Karamjeet, in connection with the amount due from Karamjeet. He further submits that, as per the MLR, there were as many as nine injuries on the person of the deceased and that a mobile phone ITEL Black colour, black jacket and white gloze pertaining to the deceased were recovered from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The allegations against the petitioner are specific, grave and serious in nature. It could not be shown that there was any motive on the part of the complainant for the false implication of the petitioner. Moreover, the complainant is yet to be examined. On the other hand, if released on bail, there is every likelihood of the accused tampering with the evidence or winning over the witnesses.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

24.05.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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