

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-48244-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 29.09.2023

Ramphal .
..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. NK Chhokar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG, 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.105 dated 29.05.2020, registered under Sections 147, 148, 307 and 323 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 325 and 201 IPC added later on), at Police Station Sanoli, District Panipat.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for about 5 months. Though the petitioner was named in the FIR, however, there was no specific role ascribed to him. It was a fight that took place between two groups wherein both parties received injuries, however, no cross DDR was registered at the behest of petitioner and his co-accused. The grievous injury in the present FIR has been attributed to Shiv Charan, Mahipal and Sansar. A similarly circumstanced co-accused Abhishek @ Taraspal, who was also named in the FIR and stated to be a member of unlawful assembly but no specific injury attributed to him, has been

granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 26.05.2023 after having been in custody for about 2 months as also Ram Pal, Sonu, Vinod and Devi Singh, vide orders dated 10.11.2022, 27.02.2023, 19.12.2022 and 28.08.2023, respectively. Other co-accused namely Nabab @ Nawab, Sukhpal, Jony @ Joginder and Ompal have been granted anticipatory bail. Challan stands presented on 26.07.2023 but charges are yet to be framed against the petitioner and in all there are 43 prosecution witnesses. He is involved in two more cases, however, in one, he is on bail. 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 28.09.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 4 months and 14 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of offence being a part of unlawful assembly and is involved in two more cases. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the trial, co-accused have been granted anticipatory and regular bail and the petitioner being on bail in one case.

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 last 4 months and 14 days; on bail in one case; co-accused have been enlarged on bail; challan was presented on 26.07.2022, however, charges have not been framed so far and there a total of 43 prosecution witnesses; 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.

29.09.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No