

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

109

**CRM-M-45889-2021
Date of Decision: 07.01.2022**

Deepak Nehra

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

Case has been taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing.

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C has been moved by petitioner-**Deepak Nehra** for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.381 dated 28.07.2021 under Sections 201, 420, 468 and 471 IPC (Sections 120-B and 419 IPC and Section 52 of National Disaster Management Act, 2005, added later on, whereas Sections 201, 468 and 471 IPC deleted later on), registered at Police Station Hisar City, District Hisar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that version, as alleged in the FIR, is totally concocted one and there is no iota of truth therein. He further submits that allegedly petitioner being Lab Technician generated false COVID positive report of Inspector Gurmeet Singh so that it can be used by said Inspector Gurmeet Singh as an excuse to accompany accused of another case FIR for NARCO test for which, said

accused were to be taken by him (Inspector Gurmeet Singh) at Gandhi Nagar, Gujarat. He further urges that above said allegations are altogether false and frivolous and there is no iota of truth therein. He further submits that co-accused Neeraj Mehta has already been extended concession of regular bail by Sessions Court, vide order dated 19.10.2021 (Annexure P/3). He further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 04.10.2021 and he is no more required by the Police for any investigation purpose as after completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court on 01.12.2021 and trial has commenced. He further urges that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and he may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing instant petition has vehemently argued that keeping in view seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the contents of petition.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is in custody since 04.10.2021; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation purpose; that *Challan* has already been presented in Court and since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, he deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner-**Deepak Nehra** is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Hisar, as the case may be.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

07.01.2022

Varinder Prashad

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No