

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

CRM-M-16896-2023

Date of Decision: 18.04.2023

Neetu

...Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Sunny Kadiyan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Karan Garg, AAG Haryana.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA J. (ORAL)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in the case bearing FIR No.0296 dated 09.06.2022 registered under Section 307, 34, 120-B, 216 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Civil Line Sonapat, District Sonapat, Haryana.

Brief facts of the facts are that the FIR was registered on the complaint of complainant Parvesh to the effect that the complainant is running a medical store in the name and style of Goodluck Medical Store for the last 21 years on Rathdhana Road, near Patel Nagar and Dinesh, Deen Dayal, Sahil and Dinesh Saini are working as salesman. On 08.06.2022 he along with salesman Deendayal was sitting on medical store and at about 9.30 PM salesman Deendayal went for urination and complainant was talking on phone. In the meantime one young unknown boy with muffled face came and asked for painkiller and went outside and after some time he came again on counter and took out pistol and fired on the complainant but

fire shot missed and thereafter, he again loaded the pistol and fired on the complainant with intention to kill him. But complainant narrowly escaped by hiding himself on backside of medicine rack. On these allegations, FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the initial FIR was registered against the unknown persons and he has been named in the FIR on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Rahul, Vicky, Narinder and Ankush, where Narinder and Ankush have already been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 24.02.2023 and claims parity as Narinder and present petitioner namely, Neetu both were sitting in the car. Challan has been presented on 09.08.2022. The petitioner is in custody since the date of arrest and trial of the case will take sufficient long time and no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the aforesaid prayer. He however, admits that the investigation in the present case has been completed and the challan has been presented and charges have been framed on 11.01.2023. Out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, none of the witness has been examined till date.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and gone through the entire case file. The investigation of the case has been completed and challan stands presented. The conclusion of the trial would take considerable time, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further incarcerated.

As such, sufficient mitigating circumstances are made out to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. Therefore, without making

any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, if not required in any other case.

The petition is allowed.

18.04.2023
sapna

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No