

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16283-2024
DECIDED ON:22.04.2024

RAVINDER SAHNI ALIAS RAVEN ALIAS RAMAYAN
.....PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Narinder Singh Dadwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C. has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 77, dated 25.04.2023, under Sections 302, 365, 323, 148 and 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.
2. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that there is no direct incriminating material available on record to connect the petitioner with the commissioning of offence. It is further contended that no recovery whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner. It is also his case that investigating agency while filing report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C., could not attribute any specific injury to the petitioner for attracting the provisions of Sections 302, 365, 323, 148 and 149 IPC. He placed reliance upon the order dated 01.03.2024 passed in CRM-M-5794-2024 whereby, the co-accused, who is similarly situated with the petitioner, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

3. On the other hand learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner, which would depict that he has undergone incarceration for a period of 11 months and 13 days as of now. Learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition alleging that murder has taken place and around 10 boys who were armed with sticks, kapa and sword, have attacked upon the deceased. On a specific query put by this Court, he on instructions, could not show, from the final report available with him, the role attributed to the petitioner for implicating him in the present petition.

4. Heard, learned counsel for the respective parties.

5. Be that as it may, considering the fact that no attribution of injury is coming forth in the report under Section 173 (2) Cr.P.C., which stands furnished on 24.07.2023 added with the facts that even no weapon has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, who was not even present at the place of occurrence; conclusion of trial will certainly take long time, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner cannot be detained in custody for an indefinite period and cannot be placed at par with the other co-accused armed with afore-said weapons, who may have played an active role but the petitioner was admittedly not present at the spot.

6.. In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. The present petition is, hereby, allowed in the afore-said terms.

8. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.04.2024

Sham

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

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE