

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-10473-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.04.2023

PARAMBIR ALIAS PRINCE

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.**

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.616 dated 05.10.2021, under Sections 307, 394, 427, 506 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Krishna Gate, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel contends that the custody of petitioner is 1 year and 2 months. The FIR was registered against unknown persons. The name of the petitioner surfaced based on disclosure statement of co-accused namely Harjeet, after 4 months of the alleged occurrence. The petitioner was attributed a gun shot injury allegedly fired by him, pellets of which hit the complainant, causing him the injuries in question. He is not involved in any other case. Co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 14.03.2023. 3 witnesses including the complainant have been examined, however, still 23 prosecution witnesses remain to be examined.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the

petitioner had fired a shot, pellets of which had caused injuries to the complainant. The country made pistol was recovered from the co-accused. He is however unable to controvert the submissions with regard to custody, stage of trial, the complainant having been examined, the above co-accused has been granted bail and petitioner not involved in any other case.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 2 months; his non-involvement in any other case; co-accused Harjeet Singh having been granted regular bail; the complainant stands examined besides 2 PWs out of 26, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further detention behind bars would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

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 him not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
2. The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
3. The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
7. 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.

8. The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the Trial Court forthwith and in case, he does not have the passport, he shall furnish a specific affidavit in this regard.

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.

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

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

April 25, 2023

M.Kamra

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |