

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

215

2023:PHHC:101195

CRM-M-9554-2023

Date of decision: August 4th, 2023

Manjeet @ Jeeta

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasleen Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.188 dated 19.09.2020, registered under Sections 186, 279, 307, 332, 336, 353, 483, 412, 34, 201 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25/27 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Rajound, District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that a false case has been planted upon the petitioner and that too on the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Sombir. Learned counsel has submitted that the evidentiary value of such disclosure statement is of a weak nature and there was no other evidence or material which was collected by the investigating agency, which could in any manner link the petitioner with the occurrence that took place on 19.02.2020, wherein the co-accused, who was travelling in a Swift Car, on being asked to stop by the police party, fired back at them. It has been further

submitted by the counsel that the petitioner who has been now in custody since 10.03.2021 be released on bail as the trial would take considerable time to conclude since only two prosecution witnesses out of the 18 cited have been examined till date.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel on instruction, has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. He has submitted that the petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents as it is a matter of record that there are as many as eight other criminal cases registered against him and still further even though he is in custody, he had been monitoring the operations of his gang by supplying illegal weapons to criminals for committing heinous crimes. It has also further been submitted that keeping in view his criminal antecedents, in case the petitioner is released on bail, there was every possibility that he could yet again be involved in some more criminal cases or could even try to influence the witnesses to depose in his favour and tamper with material evidence.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. *Prima facie*, the petitioner comes across as a man of criminal antecedents as he has is involved in a number of criminal cases which also include offence under the Prisons Act. This Court in the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove does not deem it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. The instant petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

7. However, since the petitioner has been in custody since 10.03.2021, the trial Court would make earnest efforts to expedite the

trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within six months from today.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

August 4th, 2023
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No