

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32213-2022

Date of decision : 29.07.2022

Shankar Lal Meena

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Charanji Lal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Gurbir S. Dhillon, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This is a first petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR no.124 dated 22.04.2022 registered under Sections 389 and 420 IPC (Sections 384 and 120 IPC added later on) at Police Station Sector 9A, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.04.2022 and challan has already been presented and there are 11 prosecution witnesses and none have been examined thus, the trial is likely to take time and the petitioner is not involved in any other case. It is further submitted that the case is triable by Magistrate. It is contended that it was the co-accused namely Ajay Chauhan, who had made the alleged extortion call.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present petition for regular bail and has submitted that it is in the account of the present petitioner that the money has been deposited and the other

accused are yet to be arrested.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner, in order to show his bonafide and without admitting his liability, is ready to pay an amount of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant Amit Vats within a period of 8 weeks from today.

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper book.

The petitioner has been in custody since 26.04.2022 and challan has already been presented and there are 11 prosecution witnesses and none have been examined and thus, the trial is likely to take time and the petitioner is stated to be not involved in any other case. The case is triable by the Magistrate. The petitioner in order to show his bonafide and without admitting his liability, is ready to pay an amount of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant within a period of 8 weeks from today.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate and subject to him not being required in any other case and subject to him depositing an amount of Rs.50,000/- in the trial Court within a period of 8 weeks from today and the trial Court is directed to release the said amount to the complainant. The payment of said amount shall not be construed as an admission of guilt. In case, the said amount of Rs.50,000/- is not deposited within the aforesaid period, then it would be open to the State and the complainant to move an application for cancellation of bail.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of

opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

July 29, 2022
Davinder Kumar

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