

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

209

CRM-M-7121-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.06.2022

ANKIT SODHI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this 2nd petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.269 dated 06.08.2021, registered under Sections 417, 420 and 511 IPC, at Police Station Uklana, District Hisar.

Reply by way of an affidavit dated 04.04.2022 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Barwala, filed on behalf of the respondent-State in Court, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that the petitioner is a student of B.A Part-I, who has been in custody since 09.08.2021 and that co-accused, namely, Sanjay Dahiya, Satnam @ Satu and Amit Kumar Sodhi, have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court. He further submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had given his mobile phone along with two SIM cards to co-accused, namely, Sanjay Dahiya (cousin brother of the petitioner).

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner had actively participated in the occurrence, inasmuch as, he had handed over his personal mobile phone to the co-accused and that Rs.5,000/- along with mobile phone and two SIM cards were recovered from him. He further submits that prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 09.08.2021. Recovery has already been effected. Co-accused have already been enlarged on bail. Prosecution evidence is yet to commence. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

01.06.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>