

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 703-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.02.2023

Ravi

... Petitioner

V/s.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present : Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate with
Mr. Eashan Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, AAG, Haryana

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No. 230 dated 29.06.2022, under Sections 120-B, 177, 182, 193, 205, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC registered at Police Station Madhuban, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2022. He submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the petitioner was just a passer-by and saw one accident took place and picked the call when deceased's phone was ringing and informed the brother of the deceased about the accident, due to which he was roped in MACT case. He further submits that other co-accused-Gurbaaz, Kismat, Arti and Gurmeet Singh have also been granted interim bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and challan stands

presented in the MACT case and that the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Reply has been filed by the respondent-State and the same is taken on record. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he does not dispute the fact that other co-accused have been granted bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 14.08.2022.

It is not a case made out by the respondent-State that in case concession of bail is granted to the petitioner, he would hamper the course of free and fair trial. Further, since the co-accused have already been granted bail and the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bar.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

02.02.2023
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes /No