

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

231

CRM-M-37887-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.08.2023

Vikas

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. S.S. Kanwar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Virk Sr. DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.429 dated 21.07.2022, registered under Section 379-B IPC (Sections 201, 411 and 34 IPC added later on), at Police Station Ganaur, District Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for 1 year and about 1 month. He alleges false implication. There is a delay of 18 hours in lodging the FIR. Co-accused Jitender has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 25.07.2023, Annexure P-2, after being in custody for 7 months. Charges stand framed on 28.03.2023 but none out of 9 PWs have been examined. The petitioner is not involved in any other case under the IPC.

3. The custody certificate dated 09.08.2023 has been filed by learned State counsel. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year and 17 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the

petitioner had actively participated in the commission of offence and recovery of Rs.300/- as well as a danda had been effected from him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions with regard to the stage of the case, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the IPC.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 17 days; not involved in any other case; co-accused has been granted bail; charges were framed on 28.03.2023, however, none out of 9 PWs have yet been examined, 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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

August 10, 2023

M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No