

CRM-M-47975-2022

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

CRM-M-47975-2022

Date of decision: 21.10.2022

Robin

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 567 dated 14.9.2020, registered under Sections 379, 34, 420 IPC (Sections 395, 365, 397, 120 B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act added later on and Sections 379, 34, 420 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Sadar, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that vide compromise dated 22.12.2021 (Annexure P-3), the matter has been settled between the accused and the complainant, and that even a petition for quashing of FIR, on the basis of compromise, has already been filed.

Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 07.09.2022, and that co-accused, namely, Imran has since been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 26.10.2021 whereas co-accused, namely, Lukman has been released on regular bail by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Gurugram,

CRM-M-47975-2022

vide order dated 11.01.2021.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner alongwith co-accused had induced the complainant; that an amount of Rs.90,000/- had been transferred in the account of the petitioner; that mobile SIM used for the commission of offence and Rs.20,000/- being his share, had been recovered from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Though specific allegations of inducing the complainant are against the petitioner, yet the fact remains that co-accused Imran and Lukman have been granted the concession of bail. Moreover, a compromise has been effected between the complainant and all the accused.

The petitioner has been in custody since 07.09.2022. Challan is yet to be presented against the petitioner. Trial is unlikely to conclude any time soon. Therefore, 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 present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

21.10.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No