

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

CRM-M-13488-2021(O&M)

Date of decision: 14.07.2022

Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

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. 29 dated 30.01.2019, registered under Sections 341, 365, 397, 506 IPC read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor any recovery was effected from him; that the petitioner arrested in case bearing FIR No. 91 dated 14.04.2019 registered at Police Station Uklana, District Hisar, and on his disclosure statement in the said case, recorded on 29.04.2019, the petitioner was indicted in the present case; that as per the allegation, one mobile phone was recovered from the petitioner; that the snatched car has already been recovered from co-accused Salim Khan, who has already been granted regular bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 23.10.2019 and that the petitioner has been in

custody for the last more than three years. As far as other cases are concerned, the petitioner is on bail and was involved on disclosure statements.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime. The petitioner is a habitual offender and involved in six other cases. 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 for the last more than three years. In other cases, wherein he was involved on the basis of disclosure statements, the petitioner is on bail. The recovery has already been effected. Therefore, 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

14.07.2022
Mangal Singh

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