

218

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

**CRM-M-32828-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.03.2022**

Anil @ Lila

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.192, dated 13.05.2010 under Sections 302, 307, 392, 148 & 149 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody from 14.01.2012, which is more than 10 years and the trial is progressing at a very slow pace in view of the fact that after the filing of the challan *qua* the petitioner, the supplementary challan was also presented before the competent Court and an application under Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. was also filed which ultimately delayed the trial. He further submitted that considering the custody of the petitioner, he may be considered for the grant of bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that a detailed affidavit has been

filed by the State in the present case and while referring to the affidavit, he has referred to Para No.4 wherein it has been stated that the petitioner is involved in as many as 21 other cases. In some of the cases although the petitioner has been acquitted but the chart shows that the petitioner is an undertrial in four other cases pertaining to Section 302 of IPC and in one case under Section 302 of IPC, the petitioner was also convicted.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that while considering the facts and circumstances of the present case and the allegations against the petitioner in the present case as well as the custody of the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioner particularly in view of the antecedents of the petitioner. However, in view of the fact that the petitioner has undergone more than 10 years, which is a very long custody and the petitioner has a right of speedy trial, it will be in the interest of justice to direct the trial Court to expedite the trial.

Consequently, the trial Court is directed to ensure that the trial is expedited as early as possible.

The present petition stands disposed of.

The copy of this order be sent to the learned trial Court.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

28.03.2022

Bhumika

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable: | Yes/No |