

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

213

CRM-M No.12516 of 2024
Date of Decision: 24.04.2024

RAMAN KUMAR ALIAS ROMI ALIAS RAMAN BHALLA
.....Petitioner

Vs
STATE OF PUNJAB **....Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA, 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.244 dated 08.10.2020 registered under Sections 302, 34 IPC (Section 460 IPC added later on) at P.S. City Patti, District Tarn Taran.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated for his involvement in the alleged murder of father-in-law of the complainant as he was nominated in the present case on the statement of Raj Kumar son of Piare Lal.
3. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while referring to the statement made by Raj Kumar son of Piare Lal as per which *prima facie* involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence has been made out besides serious nature of allegation levelled against him.

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 already stands concluded with the filing of challan followed by framing of charges. Out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 17 witnesses have been examined. The petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years and 06 months and is not involved in any other case. Present case is of circumstantial evidence and even three of the material witnesses of the prosecution while appearing as PW-3, PW-5 and PW-6 have turned hostile having failed to support the prosecution version.
6.

In view of aforesaid circumstances, the trial is likely to take sometime in its culmination, therefore, 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.
8.

It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

April 24, 2024
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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