

221

2023:PHHC:076141

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25421-2023
DECIDED ON: 25th MAY, 2023

MANI PARAS @ MANI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kumar Dhot, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C., has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 122, dated 13.05.2020, registered under Section 302, 427, 148, 149 and 120-B IPC (Section 201 IPC was added lateron) and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named as an accused in the FIR and he is sought to be indicted as an accused on the basis of supplementary statement of the first informant, recorded on the next day of the day of the occurrence. He further contends that neither any arms nor any other material connecting the petitioner has been recovered on his disclosure statement. He submits that there was no eye-witness of the alleged murder and the petitioner is sought to be indicted as an accused solely on the basis of

supplementary statement of the first informant. He submits that the co-accused of the petitioner namely Jaspreet Singh has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 04.11.2020 passed in CRM-M-35044-2020, apart from this six other accused persons have also been granted the concession of regular bail in different petitions.

3. Custody certificate of the petitioner filed by the counsel for the State is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 3 years and 5 days as of now.

4. On completion of the investigation, the challan has been presented in the Court and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, it is considered appropriate to direct the petitioner to be released on regular bail as the conclusion of the trial is likely to take time. Hence, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate

5. The present petition is allowed in view of afore-said terms.

6. However, it is made clear that any observation made hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25th MAY, 2023
sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*