

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

CRM-M-30164-2022

Date of Decision: 20.7.2022

Vinod

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Naveen Siwach, Advocate,
for the complainant.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.162 dated 15.3.2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 342, 365, 397, 506, 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Sections 324 IPC and Section 25(1-B) and 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act added later on) at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was later on, arraigned as accused on the basis of the disclosure made by co-accused Randeep. Counsel further contends that similarly situated co-accused namely Ashok @ Shoki, Vikram @ Khan, Jagmal and Baljit have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide separate orders. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 15.3.2022 and is presently lodged in judicial custody. It is further submitted

that Challan has been presented by the police on completion of investigation.

State counsel while opposing the present petition submits that the petitioner is facing serious charges of kidnapping and the trial is yet to commence. However, the State counsel has not refuted the fact regarding the grant of regular bail to co-accused namely Ashok @ Shoki and that investigation has been completed. Even the custody period of the petitioner has not been denied by the State counsel.

Counsel for the complainant submits that he has no objection if the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted bail.

In view of above, as the investigation has already been completed but the charges have not been framed and thereafter, it will take time for the trial to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any further period.

In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

July 20, 2022

Paritosh Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No