



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51664-2024
Date of Decision:24.10.2024

Sanjeev @ Sunny and Anr. ...Petitioners

vs.

State of Haryana ...Respondent

Coram : Hon’ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C with a prayer to grant regular bail to them in case FIR No. 210, dated 07.06.2024, under Sections 392 and 394 of IPC, registered at Police Station DLF, Phase-1, District Gurugram (Haryana) (Annexure P-1).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that the petitioners have been falsely involved in the present case. He further contends that the even no such occurrence had taken place, as alleged by the complainant. He further contends that during the course of investigation, the recovery of Rs.700 were shown to be recovered from the petitioner No.1, whereas, the recovery of a scooty and Rs.500/- were planted on petitioner No.2. As per him, both the petitioners were arrested on 08.06.2024 and 07.06.2024 respectively and are in custody since then. Learned counsel further contends that after completion of the investigation, the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C has already been

presented against both of them before the Court. Even charge has not been framed against the petitioners and the trial is yet to formally commence against them. There are no chances of early conclusion of the trial. He further contends that two more FIRs were ordered to be registered against petitioner No.1, whereas, one more FIR were registered against petitioner No.2, however, both the petitioners are on bail in the said cases.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against both the petitioners and the present petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioners are in custody for the last more than four months and after completion of the investigation, challan has already been presented against them before the Court. Since the charge has not been framed against the petitioners, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial in the near future.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

24.10.2024
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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