

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

224

CRM-M-12806-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.08.2023

Tarun

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Lekhraj Nandal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Virk Sr. DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.15 dated 25.01.2020, registered under Sections 342, 365, 395, 397 and 412 IPC and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Manesar, District Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 8 months. He alleges false implication. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Ikram, who has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 09.09.2020 (Annexures P-2). The alleged recovery of the looted articles was effected from co-accused Jabir, who has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 06.04.2023 (Annexure P-3). Another co-accused, Junaid @ Bhuri, who is similarly situated to the petitioner, has been granted regular bail vide order dated 10.06.2022 (Annexures P-4). Charges have been framed on 04.01.2023, however, out of 33 prosecution witnesses, only 3

(including the complainant) have been examined. The petitioner is not involved in any other case of similar nature, but for one FIR under Section 174-A IPC registered against him, wherein he is on bail. In this regard, 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. The custody certificate dated 05.08.2023 has been filed by learned State counsel. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for the last 8 months and 02 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of offence and was specifically named by co-accused Ikram. Recovery of Rs.20,000/- was effected from him while mobile phone was recovered from the other co-accused. He is however unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of case, co-accused having been granted bails and the petitioner also on bail in another case.

5. Heard.

6. 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 the possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 02 days; on bail in another case; is implicated on the basis of disclosure statement; co-accused having been

granted bail; charges stand framed on 04.01.2023, however, only 2 witnesses besides the complainant have been examined, out of 33 prosecution witnesses, 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

August 07, 2023
M.Kamra

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