

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

**CRM-M No.21064 of 2021
Date of Decision: 27-01-2022**

RaviPetitioner.
Versus
State of HaryanaRespondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

* * * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of regular bail in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.302 dated 20.08.2018 registered at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat, under Sections 302, 120-B, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by complainant-Dinesh in the subject FIR, are that on 19.08.2018, the petitioner came to their house and talked to his brother Surrender (victim/ since deceased) regarding some money transaction and said that he would settle the account with the victim in the evening. Thereafter, he (petitioner) took the victim along-with him on his motor-cycle and in the evening, he (complainant) received the information regarding the victim having

suffered the fire-arm injuries and he reached at the spot and found the victim lying dead there. He (complainant) suspected that the petitioner had killed his afore-named brother at the instance of Kuldeep @ Kala, Om Parkash and Raju as a case was pending in Court between them and his brother who was to appear as a witness in the same.

Reply has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is behind the bars since the day of his arrest, i.e 28.08.2018 and the case is based on circumstantial evidence and the complainant who is stated to have seen the victim for the last time in the company of the petitioner, has turned hostile while appearing as PW-7 in the trial Court and has not supported the version of prosecution against the petitioner and in these circumstances, the petitioner deserves the relief as prayed for in the instant petition.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the afore-referred factual position but he opposes the prayer of the petitioner on the ground of gravity of the offence as committed in the present case.

Keeping in view the afore-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the fact that the trial of the case is likely to take quite some time to conclude and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petitioner named Ravi is ordered to be released on

regular bail subject to his furnishing the requisite personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition in hand stands allowed accordingly.

27th January, 2022
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>