

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

222

CRM-M-1264-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.08.2023

Ravi Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.92 dated 14.04.2022, registered under Sections 307 and 34 IPC and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Chhansa, District Faridabad.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 1 year and 4 months, having been arrested on 16.04.2022. The FIR was registered against an unknown persons. The petitioner got implicated in the case on his having been arrested in another FIR, wherein he allegedly made a disclosure statement regarding involvement in this case and a firearm was recovered from him. As per the allegations, attribution to him is of having caused injuries on the left wrist and the bullet scraping the waist of the complainant, but who has not supported the prosecution version. Besides him, two more prosecution witnesses have been examined, out of a total 21. Co-accused has been granted

regular bail vide order dated 01.08.2022, Annexure P2. He is involved in two more cases under the Arms Act and Excise Act, wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of offence and caused two injuries on the left wrist and waist of the complainant. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the custody, stage of the trial, petitioner being on bail in another case and co-accused has been granted bail.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 4 months; on bail in other case; co-accused has been granted regular bail; only 3 witnesses, out of 21 have yet been examined, including the complainant, who has not supported the prosecution version; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any

useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

7. As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of

the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

29.08.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No