



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

311

CRM-M No.31091 of 2024
Date of Decision: 10.07.2024

Ravi Kumar @ Karna ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of
Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
75	29.07.2021	Rohadai, District Rewari	379, 427, 120B, 420, 467, 468, 411, 413 and 471 of IPC, 3 and 4 of Explosive Substances Act, 1908, 15 and 16 of Petroleum and Minerals Pipe Lines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 and 3 and 4 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984

2024:PHHC:087221



2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint lodged by the Operational Manager of Indian Oil Corporation Limited (IOCL) alleging therein that on 29.07.2021 on receipt of information from Guard Sukhveer that crude oil was spilling from the pipeline passing through the agricultural land of one Umed at Village Palhawas, he had visited there and found that someone had created a hole by installing a valve in the pipeline from where the oil was spilling. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During the course of investigation, the present petitioner and the co-accused were apprehended and arrested. He moved applications for grant of bail which were dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari vide order dated 30.11.2023 and subsequently on 23.01.2024 citing no change in the circumstances.

3. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is not named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in this case. The co-accused whose case is on similar footing has been extended benefit of bail by this Court. On the ground of parity, he too deserves to be extended benefit of bail. He is in custody since 21.01.2022. The trial is likely to take time. Therefore, it is argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Per contra, it is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail as he is a habitual offender and has committed similar offences. Four other cases have been registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding if extended benefit of bail. His case is not at parity with the

2024:PHHC:087221



case of the co-accused, therefore, he argued that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel at considerable length and have gone through the record.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 21.01.2022. It is revealed from the record that all other co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. The trial is likely to take time as not even a single witness has been examined so far despite the fact that the petitioner is in custody for over a period of two and half years. No doubt, the petitioner has criminal antecedents but that only cannot be considered to be a ground to reject the plea for release on bail as made by the petitioner. Further incarceration of the petitioner is not warranted. As such, in my considered opinion, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any more. In view of the discussion as made above but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to the petitioner’s furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

10.07.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No