

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 44631-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.03.2023

Paramjit alias Pammy alias Khan

... Petitioner

V/s.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present : Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Garg, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.59 dated 29.07.2019 under Sections 307, 392, 397, 120-B, 379-B, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Industrial Area, Sector 29, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 30.04.2021. He submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as he is neither named in the FIR nor any recovery has been effected from him. He further submits that the challan stands filed and the co-accused Ravinder alias Yogender, Manjeet and Gurpreet have already been released on bail by the trial Court and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Custody certificate has been filed by the respondent-State, which is taken on record. Even though learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature, however, does not dispute that the challan stands filed and the co-accused have been granted bail by the trial Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 30.04.2021.

It is not a case made out by the respondent-State that in case concession of bail is granted to the petitioner, he would hamper the course of free and fair trial. Further, since nothing has been recovered from the petitioner and the co-accused have been allowed bail and the challan stands presented and the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

17.03.2023

seema

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes /No</i>