

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

229

CRM-M-24665-2023

Date of Decision.:18.08.2023

Amarjeet

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate for
the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail by way of petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.558 dated 31.08.2017 registered under Sections 120-B, 186, 307, 353, 115 of the IPC and Sections 25-54-59 of Arms Act (Sections 148, 149 of the IPC added and Section 120-B of the IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner was earlier allowed bail vide order dated 12.07.2019 (copy Annexure P-2). Learned counsel further contends that petitioner was regularly appearing in the Court till 12.02.2021. However, thereafter he did not appear due to some misunderstanding of the date and ultimately he was declared proclaimed officer. Learned counsel further contends that petitioner was later on arrested on 24.08.2022 and since then he is in custody.

3. Aforesaid facts are not refuted by learned State counsel. Custody certificate reveals that petitioner is in custody since 24.08.2022 i.e.

CRM-M-24665-2023

approximately for the last 01 year after his arrest, after being declared as proclaimed offender.

4. No purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars. Considering the fact that petitioner had earlier been allowed bail but without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed and petitioner is admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

August 18, 2023
Neetika Tuteja

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No