

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****217****CRM-M-18534-2023 (O&M)****Date of decision: 23.08.2023**

Deepak @ Deepak Kharb

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

Present: Mr. Surinder Singh Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARUN MONGA, J. (Oral)**

After being declined bail by learned trial Court, petitioner before this Court seeks his release as an undertrial in a case bearing FIR No.372 dated 29.06.2022, registered under Sections 285, 386, 436, 452, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 120-B of IPC subsequently added) at Police Station, Gohana Sadar, District Sonipat.

2. Case of the prosecution is that on 28.06.2022, SI Sandeep Singh was on night patrolling duty along with his colleagues. He got information that a liquor vend burning incident has taken place in village Katwal. When he went there, along with his colleagues, the salesman Vikash at the liquor shop told him that formal police complaint, after having talk with owner, would be filed. Fire Brigade was called and Head Constable Vikas was left on duty at the spot to guard the shop.

2.1. Subsequently, complainant namely, Krishan, gave a police complaint stating that he has taken the liquor vend on contract for the Farmana Zone and is operating it in partnership with another person named Rajender. The village of Katwal also falls within this zone. They have employed Vikas as their salesman. On the 28th of June, 2022, three unidentified individuals arrived on a motorcycle and knocked on the shutter of the liquor vend, which was closed at that

time. They demanded a bottle of liquor. When the salesman attempted to provide them with liquor from underneath the shutter of the liquor vend, the boys forcibly lifted the shutter, entered the premises, and caught hold of the salesman. These intruders were in possession of a bottle of petrol, which they used to set the liquor vend on fire. The salesman managed to escape from the liquor vend. However, the intruders chased him and fired a shot into the air to intimidate him. They also threatened to kill him, asserting that if they intended to continue operating the liquor vend, they would be required to pay them a 30% commission; otherwise, face the dire consequences. FIR was registered. Deepak (present petitioner), Himanshu and Tayush were arrested and, while in custody, they allegedly confessed of their guilt of having committed the crime in question. Petitioner is in custody since 26.07.2022.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner contends that neither is there any loss to the life nor property. In fact, petitioner had merely gone to purchase some liquor and due to some heated altercation verbal assault ensued from both sides. No physical assault has either been alleged nor was resorted to by any of the accused. The allegation *qua* burning of the shop is also incorrect as no such fire incident took place by sprinkling petrol or otherwise by the petitioner. It is all a concocted narrative. Petitioner is not even named in the FIR.

3.1. Learned counsel for petitioner also submits that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and he is not required for further custodial interrogation. There is no likelihood of petitioner tampering with evidence and/or influencing prosecution witnesses.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail petition. He submits that petitioner has committed a serious offence. He would argue that petitioner is set up by one of the business rivals of the complainant, who is also into liquor business and it is on account of the old business rivalry that shops of

the complainant were sought to be torched by petitioner and co-accused. They are the actual miscreants and masqueraded to buy liquor at odd hours once the shop had closed by knocking at the shutter and thereafter committing the offence in question. He further submits that during interrogation, petitioner in his disclosure statement had disclosed that the country made pistol used by him at the time of occurrence had already been recovered in another case FIR No.373 of 2022 of Police Station, Sadar Gohana. If petitioner is granted concession of bail, there are chances of his fleeing from justice. He further submits that two other cases of similar nature are pending against the petitioner.

5. On a Court query, learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Satbir, submits that challan has been presented. Investigation *qua* petitioner is complete and thus he is not required for any further custodial interrogation. Charges were framed on 28.02.2023. Allegations against petitioner are mater of trial at this stage. Out of 25 prosecution witnesses, 03 have been examined till date. Conclusion of trial is still likely to take long time as it is proceeding at a snail pace. Bail allows an accused to maintain his freedom until his guilt or innocence is determined. Whereas, petitioner has already been languishing in jail for the past about 01 year and 27 days, being behind bars since 26.07.2022.

6. Petitioner is being kept in preventive custody merely on an unfounded suspicion that if he is let out, he may either tamper with evidence and/or influence witnesses.

7. Petitioner is stated to be a young boy, aged 22 years and is on the cross-roads of his career and his future is getting severely jeopardized due to prolonged incarceration. Having got a family and fixed abode, it is unlikely that he poses any flight risk and/or will flee from trial proceedings.

8.           Considering the overall scenario and without commenting on merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. I am of the view that no useful purpose would be served to keep petitioner in further preventive custody in instant case.
9.           Accordingly, petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, in case not required in any other case, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, where his case is being tried and in case, he/she is not available, before learned Duty Judge, as the case may be.
10.          In case, petitioner is found to be involved or get involved in any offence while on bail, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail in the instant case.
11.          It is made clear that any observations and/or submissions noted hereinabove shall not have any effect on merits of the case as the same are for the limited purpose of hearing the instant bail petition alone and learned trial Court shall proceed without being influenced with this order.
12.          Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)  
JUDGE

23.08.2023  
vandana

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