

CRA-S-481-2024 (O&M) -1-
(232)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-481-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.02.2024

RAVI
... Appellant
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Yoginder Singh Rana, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Asstt. A.G., Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

CRM-5324-2024

This is an application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act
for condonation of delay of 612 days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the delay of 612 days is hereby condoned.

CRM-5326-2024

The present application has been filed by the applicant-appellant
for placing on record Annexures A-1 to A-7.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and Annexures A-1 to A-7 are taken on record.

CRA-S-481-2024

The present appeal under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of
regular bail in case bearing FIR No.136 dated 27.06.2020 registered under

CRA-S-481-2024 (O&M)

-2-

Sections 148, 149, 302, 364, 404 IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act at Police Station Safidon, District Jind.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Dimple wife of Surender (deceased) who stated that on 23.06.2020 her husband Surender son of Rajender had gone to meet her brother Sunil son of Dilbag. There had been an altercation between her husband Surender and one Boch son of Rajveer a few days earlier on the telephone. On the date of the occurrence, her husband Surender along with one Ashish son of Buta and her (complainant's) nephew went to the Dargah of Peer Baba Safidon while she followed them on foot. Near the Majar of the Peer Baba, she saw some person including Boch, Ravi (petitioner) and Ashu at the spot along with her husband. Meanwhile, two or three other boys came on their motorcycle. She recognized the said three boys. They all forcibly pushed her husband and got him to sit in a white car and went away. Thereafter, they killed her husband in the car and after the car broke down, they left the body of her husband and ran away.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant contends that PW1-Ashish (Annexure A-1), PW3-Suresh @ Bittu (Annexure A-2) and PW5-Dimple (Annexure A-4) have been examined as prosecution witnesses and have not supported the case of the prosecution. The CCTV camera from the place of the occurrence was also got examined from the witnesses and they have not identified the appellant therein. As all the material witnesses have turned hostile, only 08 of the 32 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far and the appellant was in custody since 04.07.2020, he was entitled to the concession of bail moreso when Suresh @ Bittu, Tejinder @ Golu Sardar and

CRA-S-481-2024 (O&M)

-3-

Sumit @ Sunny had been granted the concession of bail vide Annexures A-5 to A-7.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that serious allegations have been levelled against the appellant and his co-accused. Therefore, he was not entitled to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the appellant was in custody since 04.07.2020, only 08 of the 32 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, all the material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and that 3 co-accused have been granted the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, the three material witnesses have been examined and have not supported the prosecution case. Whether the remaining evidence is sufficient to affix the liability upon the appellant shall be adjudicated upon during the course of Trial. The appellant is in custody since 04.07.2020 and only 08 of the 32 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. As such, the further incarceration of the appellant is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant-Ravi son of Rohtash is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The appellant (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same

CRA-S-481-2024 (O&M)

-4-

would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the appellant from trial without sufficient cause.

9. The appeal stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

09.02.2024

JITESH

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