

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-7072-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2024

Aman

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Reetesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.81 dated 08.03.2023 registered under Sections 302, 148, 149 IPC at Police Station Urban State, District Rohtak.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not named in the FIR and it was only on the basis of a disclosure statement of co-accused Raunak, the petitioner's name came up. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Therefore, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. The petitioner is in custody since 09.03.2023 and the petitioner is not involved in any other case.
3. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel by referring to the serious nature of allegations leveled against the petitioner besides stating that challan in the present case has been presented before the trial Court on 19.05.2023, however, the

charges have yet not been framed and the next date of hearing before the trial Court is 28.03.2024. He further submits that presence of the accused at the place of occurrence can be seen through CCTV footage.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. In the present case, the investigation has already been concluded with the filing of challan. Petitioner is not involved in any other case of similar nature and is behind the bars since 09.03.2023

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of almost one year and the trial is likely to take sometime in its culmination, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

18.03.2024

Satyawan

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No