

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

240

CRM-M-30690-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.07.2023

Deepak

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY*********

Present : Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG Haryana

***********AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.161 dated 24.03.2022, registered under Sections 306 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Adarsh Nagar Ballabgarh, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 1 year. He is the brother of the deceased and has been falsely implicated in the case. No suicide note was found and also there were no specific allegations levelled against him. Thus the ingredients of Section 107 IPC are not attracted. The petitioner is not involved in any other case. Co-accused Muskan has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 11.05.2023, Annexure P-1, after being in custody for 10 months. Complainant stands examined in this case and has not supported the case of the prosecution. 15 PWs remain to be examined.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was named in the FIR and there are serious allegations levelled against him of giving false complaint against the deceased. He is however unable to

controvert the submissions with regard to custody, stage of the case, co-accused has been granted bail, the petitioner not involved in any other case and the complainant not having supported the prosecution version.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 1 year; is not involved in any other case; co-accused has been granted regular bail; complainant already stands examined, who has not supported the prosecution version; there are 15 more prosecution witnesses, who remain to be examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

July 06, 2023
M.Kamra

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