

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10992-2024
Date of Decision:06.03.2024

Sushil ...Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Abhishek Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chinna, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with a prayer to grant the regular bail in case FIR No.405 dated 24.10.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 201 and 120-B IPC (Sections 201 and 120-B added later on) at Police Station Faridabad Central, District Faridabad, Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the present case and has been arrayed as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by Amit Kaushik, who has been granted the regular bail by this Court. He further contends that in the present case, FIR was got registered by the complainant on 24.10.2020 and the petitioner has been arrested on 12.12.2022 after a delay of about 02 years due to some extraneous considerations. He further contends that the co-accused persons namely Amit Kaushik, Ashok Kumar and Sonu have already been granted the regular bail by this Court vide the orders dated 03.11.2023, 22.12.2023 and 15.02.2024 (Annexures P-3 to P-5 respectively).
3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the

ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is not in dispute that the similarly placed co-accused persons namely Amit Kaushik, Ashok Kumar and Sonu have already been ordered to be released on regular bail by this Court vide Annexures P-3 to P-5 respectively. The petitioner is in custody since 12.12.2022 i.e. for the last about 1 year and 3 months and further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

06.03.2024

M.Sikka

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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