

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

**111**

**CRM-M-21298-2021(O&M)  
Date of Decision: 24.01.2022**

Aman

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

----

**Present:** Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)**

Case has been taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing.

This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C has been moved by petitioner- **Aman** for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.210 dated 25.09.2020 under Sections 148, 285, 323, 324, 379-B and 506 IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Rohtak Civil Lines, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner has no nexus whatsoever with the alleged offence. She further urges that allegedly petitioner along with co-accused while armed with deadly weapons constituted unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object of said assembly inflicted simple injuries on the person of complainant/injured Ravinder and further divested him of his valuable belongings i.e. Motorcycle make Hero Honda bearing registration No.HR42-5151, whereas petitioner has no nexus whatsoever with the

alleged offence. She further urges that petitioner was not named in the FIR. She further urges that even otherwise no specific injury on the person of complainant/injured - Ravinder is attributed to the petitioner. She further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 18.10.2020 and he is no more required by the Police for any investigation purpose as after completion of investigation, final report as envisaged under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court and trial has commenced. She further submits that co-accused namely Shyam @ Tiger has already been granted bail by this Court, vide order dated 21.01.2021 passed in CRM-M-41054-2020. She further submits that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and he may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the cause of petitioner has vehemently argued that in view of seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is languishing in custody since 18.10.2020; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation purpose; that co-accused namely Shyam @ Tiger has already been granted bail by this Court, vide order dated 21.01.2021 passed in CRM-M-41054-2020; that *Challan* has already been presented in Court and since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful

purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, he deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner- **Aman** is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Rohtak, as the case may be.

**(LALIT BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.01.2022**

d.gulati

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No