

2024:PHHC:141746



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

223

CRM M-50603 of 2024
Date of Decision: 28.10.2024

Ramavtar Gujjar @ Ram Avtar	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana	...	Respondent

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

Present : Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.491 dated 18.07.2024 registered under Sections 3(5), 318(4), 351(2), 111(2), 308(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 238, 215 BNS, 2023 and 7, 7A, 13 and 8 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 at Police Station HTM Hisar, District Hisar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case by the complainant with some ulterior motive. The present case was

registered on the basis of the complaint moved by Satbir Singh Saharan with regard to Plots No. 35 and 36, which were allegedly allotted to the complainant and his daughter. The petitioner had no concern with the Plots No. 35 and 36, which were in the name of the complainant and his daughter. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 16.08.2024 and is in custody since then. Even, the police had completed the investigation and presented the challan against the petitioner. Learned counsel further contends that co-accused Sanjeev Kumar, Raj Kumar, Jai Singh and Mukesh Kumar had filed CRM M 42226 of 2024, CRM M-41553 of 2024 and CRM M-42894 of 2024, respectively, for grant of concession of anticipatory bail, which were allowed by this Court. Further, co-accused Sunil Kumar, had been granted the concession of bail in CRM M-52247-2024 whereas Pardeep Yadav has been granted the concession of bail in CRM M-45426 of 2024. Consequently, the petitioner is also entitled to concession of bail.

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. In the present case, the similarly placed co-accused Sanjeev Kumar, Raj Kumar, Jai Singh and Mukesh Kumar have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, whereas, co-accused Pardeep Yadav and Sunil Kumar have been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody since 16.08.2024 and investigation has already been completed by the police. Thus, no purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

5. 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.

28.10.2024
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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