

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

225

CRM-M-46058-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20.09.2023

Sarabpreet @ Sabbi

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. GC Shahpuri, 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 FIR No.204 dated 03.03.2022, registered under Sections 394, 379-A IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act (Section 392, 201, 120-B, 379, 411, 307 IPC, Section 29-B of Arms Act added later on and Section 379-A IPC deleted), at Police Station Yamuna Nagar City, District Yamuna Nagar.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year. His name has surfaced based on disclosure statements of co-accused, Saravjeet Singh and Munish. The allegation against him is of having done recce before the commission of offence by the other co-accused. Recovery shown to be effected is planted. Other co-accused, who allegedly entered into the shop to commit theft are in custody. One similarly situated co-accused Charanjit Kaur @ Babli has been granted regular bail by the trial Court vide order dated 12.12.2022, Annexure P3. Charges were framed on 01.11.2022 and out of 40 witnesses, only 7 have been examined including the eye-witness i.e. PW6-Gagandeep Singh, has

not supported the prosecution version. The petitioner is involved in two more cases under the IPC and Arms Act. 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 19.09.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year and 1 day.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had facilitated the co-accused to commit offence by doing recce and some ornaments were recovered from him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the trial, co-accused has been granted bail and eye-witness has not supported the prosecution version.

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."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year and 1 day; co-accused has been granted bail; charges were framed on 01.11.2022 and only 7 witnesses out of 40 have yet been examined, including the eye-witness, 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.

20.09.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No