

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-16451-2023
Date of decision: 17.04.2023

Satender @ Monu

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

Present is the second petition which has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No. 355 dated 17.12.2020, under Sections 302, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act (Sections 201, 120-B IPC and Section 29-B of the Arms Act 1959 added and Section 34 IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Safidon, District Jind.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for the last about 2 years 3 months, having been arrested on 19.01.2021. The offence under Section 302 IPC is attributed to co-accused Hakikat @ Hakki. The fire arm injuries are attributed to the co-accused Hari Om @ Lucky and Sunil @ Sinha who were alleged to have been engaged by the real brother of the deceased. The allegations against the petitioner are of having supplied the country made pistol to co-accused Hari Om @ Lucky as per his disclosure statement recorded in another FIR. Out of total of 34 prosecution witnesses, only 12 have been examined. He is

not involved in any other case.

Custody certificate filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record as per which the petitioner has been in custody for the last 2 years 2 months and 26 days.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the recovery of the weapon is from the petitioner and he is a part of the conspiracy. However, he is unable to controvert the other submissions with regard to the stage of the trial and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case particularly that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 2 years 2 months and 26 days; he is not involved in any other case; only 12 out of 34 prosecution witnesses have been examined as yet; the trial is likely to take 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 his 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, she does not have the passport, she shall furnish a specific affidavit in this regard.

It is made clear that in case of any infraction of any 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

17.04.2023

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