

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25005-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.10.2022

Bintu @ Mard

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Rao Ajender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail in FIR No.80 dated 10.03.2020 under Sections 302, 148, 149, 201, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar, District Jind.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, relies upon the order dated 08.09.2022 passed in CRM-M-37004-2020, vide which co-accused Sumesh @ Kala has been granted the concession of regular bail, considering the fact that co-accused Dinesh has been granted regular bail vide order dated 10.03.2022 passed in CRM-M-15209-2020. The operative part of the order dated 08.09.2022 reads as under: -

“Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon order dated

10.03.2022 passed by this Court in CRM-M-15209-2020, vide which co-accused Dinesh has been granted the concession of regular bail. The order reads as under:

“Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short 'Cr.P.C.') in FIR No.0080 dated 10.03.2020, for offence punishable under Sections 148, 149, 302, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Jind Sadar, District Jind.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of Ravinder @ Bucha, his brother Sonu @ Sukhbir, is a partner at a liquor vend and the complainant along with his cousin brother namely Ankit were sitting outside the liquor vend, when his brother Sonu was seen coming on a motorcycle bearing No.HR-31-6333, towards the liquor vend and when he was 150-200 meters away from the liquor vend, a white colour car came from his back side and hit on his motorcycle due to which, he fell down and in the meantime, Sourabh, Sahil and Mard, came down from the car. The complainant and Ankit ran towards the car, thereupon Sourabh took out the illegal pistol and shot on Sukhbir in his waist whereas Sahil and Mard gave kick

blows to him. When the complainant and Ankit reached there, all the said 03 persons fled away by boarding a car. He had seen the co-accused Kala and the petitioner – Dinesh were sitting in the car. Thereafter, by arranging a vehicle Sukhbir was taken for treatment to the hospital where he was declared dead.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that, in fact, it is a case of a road-rage as the car of the accused side hit the motorcycle of Sukhbir and later on, the co-accused Sourabh caused fatal fire on the deceased Sukhbir, which resulted into his death. It is also submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 27.03.2020 and investigation is complete, challan stands presented and the complainant Ravinder @ Bucha, has already been examined. Counsel for the petitioner, with reference to the cross-examination of this witness, has argued that though the petitioner was named in the FIR in the aid of Section 120-B IPC, however, in the cross-examination, this witness has stated that the accused party was not having any enmity with his brother or his family. It is also submitted that without prejudice to his right of defence and trial, the petitioner is ready to pay a sum of Rs.2.50 lacs to the LRs of the deceased.

Counsel for the State has submitted that the deceased Sukhbir was unmarried.

In reply, counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the demand draft of Rs.2.50 lacs will be prepared either in favour of the mother or father of the deceased – Sukhbir.

Reply by way of affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Jind, is on record and as per the reply, after verifying the facts as stated in the FIR, it is stated that as per the post-mortem, the deceased died due to the gun-shot injury and the accused were at large when they were apprehended in FIR No.130 dated 18.03.2020 registered under Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar Hisar. Later on, they were joined in the investigation of the present FIR and suffered the disclosure statement. The petitioner got the car No.HR-56-B-4287, which belongs to his uncle Rakesh, recovered and the petitioner was found driving the car. It is also stated that the petitioner is involved in one more FIR registered under Sections 147, 148, 323, 348, 447, 452, 506 IPC, apart from the present FIR. It is also stated that challan was presented on 22.06.2020 and out of 27 PWs, only 03 PWs have been examined.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the aforesaid facts and also in view of the fact that the petitioner has volunteered to pay a sum of Rs.2.50 lacs by way of a demand draft, either to the father or mother of the

deceased Sukhbir (only for the purpose of bail), without prejudice to his right of defence and trial and also in view of the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 11 months and 13 days; the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and the conclusion of the trial will take some time due to COVID-19 situation, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

This will, however, be subject to the condition that the petitioner will hand over a demand draft of Rs.2.50 lacs favouring the father or mother of the deceased – Sukhbir, at the time of furnishing the bail/surety bonds.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per FIR, aforesaid co-accused Dinesh was driving the car, whereas the present petitioner was a co-passenger.

Learned counsel further submitted that he has instructions to say that even petitioner is ready to pay an amount of Rs. 2.50 Lakh by way of a demand draft in favour of the father or mother of deceased Sukhbir.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner is in judicial custody for the last about 02 years and 03 months and out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, only 07

witnesses have been examined so far and it will take a long time in conclusion of the trial.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that statement of witnesses Ravinder and Ankit has already been recorded before the trial Court, therefore, there is no possibility for the petitioner to tamper with the prosecution evidence.”

Learned counsel submits that primary allegation of driving the car is against co-accused Dinesh, from whom the recovery of car bearing registration No.HR-56B-4287 was effected, as it belongs to his uncle Rakesh. It is further submitted that as on today, the petitioner is in custody for the last two years and 24 days and out of total 27 prosecution witnesses, 07 PWs have already been examined.

Status report by way of affidavit of SI Ravinder Singh, Police Station Sadar Jind, District Jind is on record, in which it is stated that the petitioner was apprehended in another FIR No.130 dated 18.03.2020 under Section 25/54/59 of Arms, Police Station Sadar Hisar and later on, he was taken on production warrants in the present FIR No.80 and his disclosure statement was recorded. It is further stated that the petitioner is involved in two more FIRs. It is also stated that during the investigation, role of the petitioner surfaced as a person, who gave kick blows to deceased Sukhbir @ Sonu, whereas co-accused Sourabh fired shot on waist of the deceased and one another co-accused Sahil also kicked the deceased. It is further stated in the affidavit that eyewitness Ravinder @ Bucha and complainant have also stated so in their statements recorded before the trial Court. It has also come in the

investigation that co-accused Kala @ Sumesh was having partnership in the liquor vends with deceased Sukhbir @ Sonu and motive behind the murder was regarding money dispute.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, without commenting anything on merits of the case and considering the fact that the complainant as well as eyewitness have already been examined, therefore, there is no possibility of tempering with the prosecution evidence and also looking into role of the petitioner and the fact that two co-accused of the petitioner have already been released on regular bail, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to furnishing his bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

Petition is disposed of.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

17.10.2022
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No