

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

234

CRM-M-27671-2023
Date of decision: 13.10.2023

Rajesh @ Candy

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.28, dated 10.01.2019, registered under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B, 379-B, 384 and 34 IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for 02 years and about 1 month. The allegations were levelled against co-accused-Sonu Dhanda and Jitender Dhanda, from whom recovery had been effected. The present FIR stands quashed vide order dated 07.02.2023, Annexure P-2, qua the main accused-Sonu Dhanda on the basis of compromise. No recovery was effected from the petitioner, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. The offences are triable by the Magistrate. Challan was presented on 16.09.2021 and charges were framed on 09.10.2022. However, none out of 17 prosecution witnesses has been examined. The petitioner is involved in 16 cases, out of which,

02 have been quashed, in 01 acquitted, on bail in 04, sentence has been suspended in 02 and in 3 sentence reduced to period undergone. Reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 09.10.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 02 years and 28 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations of having duped the complainant of a huge sum of money against the petitioner as well as his co-accused. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding stage of the trial and the status of cases.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in

particular that the petitioner is in custody for 02 years and 28 days; the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate; charges were framed on 22.07.2022 but out of a total of 17 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

8. As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.

- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

13.10.2023
Ankur

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No