

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

CRM-M-8442-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.05.2022

Deepak @ Mukul

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 229 dated 31.08.2020 registered under Sections 302, 148, 149 IPC, at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar.

Status report by way of affidavit dated 07.05.2022 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Amritsar City, submitted by the learned State counsel in the Court, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, he was indicted on the disclosure statement of the co-accused, but the complainant has not named the petitioner even in his supplementary statement recorded on 02.09.2020; that there were three injuries on the person of the deceased; that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and only the kick and fist blows have been attributed to him; that the petitioner has been in custody since 07.07.2021 and that similarly placed co-

accused Vikas @ Akash @ Kodi, has already been granted regular bail by a Coordinate Bench vide order dated 27.01.2022. The investigation is complete.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime and he in connivance with the other co-accused have committed the murder of Ravi Kumar. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 07.07.2021. The petitioner was not named in the FIR, he was named by the complainant in the supplementary statement. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner, the kick and fist blows attributed to the petitioner, which are not corroborated by the postmortem report. The conclusion of the trial would take time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

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

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

11.05.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No