

**(216) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-22870-2022
Date of Decision: 09.01.2023**

SACHIN SAINI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Asstt. A.G., Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.139 dated 01.07.2021 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 120-B, 201 IPC at Police Station Buria, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Chand son of Nasir Hasan, who stated that he was a driver. He had 9 brothers and sisters and one of his brothers namely, Shadab (deceased) was about 28 years old. On 01.07.2021, he received information from one Pintu Rana a friend of his brother Shadab that 10-12 boys had caused injuries to his brother on the bridge of Amadalpur and had fled away. Based on this information, he went to the spot along with his brothers Tajim, Mausin and Rijwan. The villagers had already called an ambulance to the spot. He along with his brothers took the injured brother Shadab to the Civil Hospital, Yamuna Nagar from where he was referred to the hospital at Chandigarh. However, on the way his

condition deteriorated and his brother was got admitted at Gaba Hospital, Yamuna Nagar where he expired. He had come to know that on account of an old enmity, Abhishek Kamboj alias Shaka, Sonu Gujjar son of Satpal, Bilal son of Matlub, Usman son of Waqil, Charanjit Rana, Abid and Monty had caused injuries on account of which his brother had expired. There were other 10/12 other unknown persons. Action was sought against the accused.

Investigation was conducted and during the course of the same, Bilal was arrested who disclosed the name of Mohit son of Jagbhushan, Sachin Saini (petitioner), Bilal, Aarif, Wasin, Intjar, Shehban Khan, Charanjit Rana and Kapil as the accused who had caused injuries with an intention to kill. Thereafter, the petitioner and Shehban Khan were arrested and suffered their disclosure statements. The petitioner got recovered a wooden *Danda* allegedly used by him in the occurrence.

The doctor opined that it could not be ruled out that the weapon recovered from the petitioner was used in the occurrence. The tower location of the phone of the petitioner was also allegedly found at the place of occurrence.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR but only in the disclosure statement of his co-accused. As per the FSL report, the wooden *Danda* recovered from him did not contain human blood as was borne out from the FSL report. The copy of the FSL report is marked as 'X'. The tower location showing the petitioner's presence around the area of the occurrence was not sufficient to affix liability upon the petitioner. Since he was in custody since 09.07.2021 and none of the 46 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, the further incarceration

of the petitioner was not warranted. Since the Trial was not likely to be concluded anytime soon.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the serious nature of the allegations do not entitle the petitioner to the grant of bail. The presence of the petitioner is established at the place of occurrence by virtue of the tower locations of his mobile phone. He however, does not dispute the fact that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and the wooden *Danda* recovered from him does not contain any human bloodstains.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner is not named in the FIR but in the disclosure statement of his co-accused. The evidentiary value of the said statement would be a matter of adjudication during Trial. The petitioner has been in custody since 09.07.2021 and none of the 46 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded in the near future. In such a situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Sachin Saini son of Ramesh Saini is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

9. If the petitioner or his family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

09.01.2023

JITESH

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