

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

CRM-M-33944-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.10.2022

Surender Kumar @ Sinder

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ravi Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 157 dated 18.05.2022 registered under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 506 IPC, at Police Station Chhappar, District Yamunanagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; that the petitioner was indicted in the present case, on the disclosure statement of co-accused Renu Kadiyan, whose car was being driven by the petitioner; that the petitioner was involved in other cases, after registration of the present FIR and that the petitioner has been in custody since 10.06.2022.

Reply filed on behalf of the respondent-State is already on record.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime. As per the status report, Renu Kadiyan and Aman Kumar in connivance with other co-accused, including the petitioner, have received Rs. 60,000/- from Subham and Prince on account of Committee and Rs. 1,50,000/- from Sukhwinder for getting job in Railway Department, approximate Rs. 1,50,000/- from Anita and other for getting job in Anganwadi and approximate Rs. 3,00,000/- for granting benefits to Salindero Devi and others under Ladli Scheme, widow pension, old age pension and Sukanya Scheme, making roof permanent. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He submits that challan stands presented.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 10.06.2022. The petitioner was indicted on the disclosure statement of the co-accused Renu Kadiyan, who was arrested on 09.06.2022. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, the conclusion of the trial would take time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

12.10.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No