

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

**CRM-M-11917-2022 (O & M)
Date of decision: 26.08.2022**

Tahil Ali

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Savita Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.151 dated 20.03.2020, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal, under Sections 406, 420, 328 and 506 read with Section 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged occurrence took place on 05.10.2019 whereas the above-noted FIR was registered on 20.03.2020 i.e. after a delay of about 05 months; that as per the arrest memo, the petitioner was arrested on 22.10.2020; that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; that no amount had ever been handed over to the petitioner at any stage; that recovery has already been effected.

Learned counsel further contends that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined; that there is no other case registered or pending against the petitioner, and that co-accused, namely, Mahant Parshant Puri and Naresh Kumar @ Rajesh have since been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 18.05.2022 passed in CRM-M-11059-2021 and CRM-M-47857-2021.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner had actively participated in the crime and that recovery of a brick purported to be made of gold and Rs.30,000/- had been effected from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The challan has already been presented. The petitioner has been in custody since 22.10.2020. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. As stated above, the co-accused have since been granted the concession of regular bail. Therefore, 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 present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

CRM-15963-2022

Since the applicant-petitioner has been released on regular bail, the present application has become infructuous.

Dismissed as having become infructuous.

26.08.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No