

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

CRM-M-22198-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: May 27, 2022

Sumreet

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

This is fourth foray of the petitioner before this Court, seeking regular bail in FIR No.592 dated 17.07.2020, registered under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (Section 201/34 IPC added later on) at Police Station Model Town Panipat, District Panipat as the earlier having been dismissed as withdrawn on different dates.

2. *Per* FIR, on 17.07.2020, complainant received an information that the entry gate of the house of her mother and sister was bolted from inside and both of them were not seen since morning. Mother of the complainant, namely Rani and her sister Geeta @ Anjali were residing at Panipat. When the complainant came to her mother's house, she found that her mother and sister were murdered by some unknown person/s. On her complaint, a case under Section 302 IPC was registered. During investigation, accused Bheem Singh, Vipin, Mohit and Sumreet (Petitioner) were arrested on 18.08.2020. Upon their interrogation, they suffered

disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the subject crime. Accused Bheem Singh and Vipin got recovered knives used at the time of the occurrence. Petitioner identified the place of occurrence.

3. Petitioner a co-accused was arrested on 18.08.2020 and since then he is in custody.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. Petitioner is a 24 years old young boy with no criminal background. He contends that the prime accused in the crime is one Bhim Singh, and as per his disclosure statement, he along with another accused Vipin entered the house of the deceased and murdered both the victims, namely Rani and her daughter Geeta. Third co-accused, namely Mohit was standing in front of the room so that both the deceased were not able to escape. He further contends that alleged knife was recovered on the basis of disclosure statement of said prime accused and no recovery of knife was effected from Mohit and the present petitioner. Petitioner, in his disclosure statement, identified the place of occurrence only. Challan has already been presented and the charges have also been framed. Prosecution testimonies are already underway and conclusion of trial will take long time and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. Further as per the learned counsel, complainant's brother Ankush is also in custody for the murder of one Idrish, who was residing in the house of complainant's mother.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that the crime committed by the petitioner along with his co-accused is of a very serious

nature. No worthy grounds are made out for granting the petitioner the concession of bail.

6. I have heard the rival contentions of the respective learned counsels.

7. Given the nature of allegations, I am not inclined to grant bail at this stage. The bail petition is accordingly dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the learned Sessions Court after the completion of recording of prosecution testimony and the Court below shall be at liberty to entertain the petition for grant of bail, if moved, and pass fresh orders, as it may deem fit.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

May 27, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No