

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

110**CRM-M-10207-2023****Date of Decision : 20.12.2023**

Karan Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Ms.Alisha Soni, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, the petitioner craves for indulgence of this Court for his being enlarged on regular bail, in case FIR No. 237, dated 02.07.2012, under Sections 302, 506, 148, 149, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Narnaund, District Hisar.
2. Initially in the FIR, petitioner could not be arrested and therefore, he was declared a proclaimed offender on dated 21.01.2013, and the petitioner was arrested after 2 ½ years of being declared a proclaimed offender i.e. on dated 25.05.2015. Thereupon, the learned trial Court concerned granted him the relief of regular bail vide order dated 01.12.2016.
3. The petitioner again absented from the trial which resulted in the declaration of the present petitioner as a proclaimed offender for the second time, vide order dated 23.03.2017. Thereupon, he again surrendered before the learned trial Court concerned on dated 19.04.2017.
4. The third time also the bail bonds of the petitioner was forfeited to the State, because of his absence from the trial on dated

06.12.2018, and he was again declared a proclaimed offender on dated 06.08.2019. Thereafter, the petitioner was arrested on dated 15.12.2021.

5. It seems that the petitioner has made a mockery of the trial, that too when facing a trial for the commission of offence under Section 302 of the IPC.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel informs this Court that the petitioner is involved in 5 more cases.

7. He further submits that out of the total 86 prosecution witnesses, cited by the prosecution, 46 witnesses have already been examined.

8. It seems that due to continuous absence of the petitioner/accused from the trial, the examination of prosecution witnesses could not be held. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant the asked for relief and the instant application is **dismissed**, with a direction to the learned trial Court concerned to make all efforts to expedite the examination of remaining prosecution witnesses.

9. The direction is also issued to the Superintendent of Police concerned, to ensure the presence of all prosecution witnesses as and when called upon by the learned trial Court concerned.

December 20, 2023
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No