

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

**228**

**CRM-M-8133-2022 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 08.07.2022**

SUKHDEV @ SUKHA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present: Mr. Sushil Kamboj, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)**

**CRM-19039-2022**

This is an application for grant of interim regular bail to the petitioner for two months.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this application.

Dismissed as not pressed.

**CRM-M-8133-2022**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.650 dated 16.11.2021 under Sections 307, 387, 34 IPC; Section 25 of the Arms Act and Sections 506, 120-B, 120 IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner

has no role to play in the alleged occurrence; that, as per the prosecution, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had supplied his mobile phone to co-accused, namely, Ashutosh, who had conversations with other co-accused; that petitioner had been indicted in the present case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused; that nothing was recovered from the petitioner; that the co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail and that the petitioner has been in custody since 21.11.2021. He further submits that challan had already been presented and that the petitioner has only been summoned under Section 120-B IPC.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner was the member of the gang, who were planning to demand ransom from the complainant and that there are specific allegations against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner along with the co-accused has been running a gang involved in committing robbery in the vicinity and that initially they were planning to demand ransom from Robin but later on changed the plan and demanded ransom from Prateek Nagpal.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 21.11.2021. The allegation against the petitioner is only of handing over his mobile phone to the co-accused. Though the petitioner has been indicted in the present

case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, yet the fact remains that there is no mention of the petitioner in the disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Amit @ Meeta. No recovery was effected from the petitioner. Co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. Prosecution evidence is yet to conclude. In such circumstances, the trail 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate/trial Court concerned.

**08.07.2022**

Aman Jain

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

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