

CRA-S-833-2024 (O&M)

-1-

(263)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-833-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.03.2024

ROCKY @ BHANJA

... Appellant

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate
for the appellant.

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

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

CRM-9416-2024

This is an application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act
for condonation of delay of 22 days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the delay of 22 days is hereby condoned.

CRA-S-833-2024

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
Sections 148, 149, 302, 364, 404 IPC, Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act
(Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and 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 (granted bail vide order dated 09.02.2024 in CRA-S-481-2024) 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.

Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, Ajay Boch was arrested and disclosed the name of the appellant.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant contends that PW1-Ashish, PW3-Suresh @ Bittu and PW5-Dimple 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 accused therein. As all the material witnesses have turned hostile, only 09 of the 39 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far and the appellant was in custody since 29.06.2020, he

was entitled to the concession of bail moreso when Suresh @ Bittu, Tejinder @ Golu Sardar, Sumit @ Sunny and Ravi had been granted the concession of bail vide Annexures A-2 to A-6.

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 29.06.2020, only 09 of the 39 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, all the material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and that 4 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 29.06.2020 and only 09 of the 39 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-Rocky @ Bhanja son of Balraj is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

CRA-S-833-2024 (O&M)

-4-

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 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

06.03.2024

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No