

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

221

CRM-M-6982-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.05.2022

ARJUN TAAK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.83 dated 12.02.2021, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and Sections 201, 120-B IPC (added later on), at Police Station Camp Palwal, District Palwal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner has been in custody since 30.07.2021; that the investigation of the case has already been completed and that the case is triable by the Magistrate. He further submits that no further recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and that in FIR No.100 dated 07.04.2021, the petitioner has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 27.04.2022. Still further, it is submitted that co-accused, namely, Vinod has already been granted the concession of bail

by the learned trial Court on 23.12.2021.

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 extracted money from many persons by providing them fake appointment letters. He further submits that post farming of the charges, prosecution evidence is yet to commence and that the petitioner is a habitual offender, inasmuch as, three more FIRs of similar nature are registered and pending against him.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 30.07.2021. In FIR No.100 dated 07.04.2021, the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail. No further recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Co-accused has already been granted the concession of bail by the trial Court. 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.

26.05.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

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