



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

216

CRM-M-24292-2024
Decided on : 18.03.2025

Surender @ Kallu

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate for
Dr. Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner – Surender @ Kallu, who has been booked for having committed the offence punishable under Sections 302, 201 of IPC (Sections 364, 201 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, added later on), in FIR No.315, dated 21.05.2020, registered at Police Station Ballabhgarh City, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. On the very outset, petitioner's counsel points out that petitioner is the sole accused, and he is there inside jail for the very long period i.e. for the last more than 04 years and 09 months. Earlier also, petitioner filed a bail petition before this Court i.e. CRM-M-52779-2022, and same was disposed of by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 31.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) by giving reasons in detail, wherein, in the last



at paragraph No.10 of the said order, it was observed as under:-

“10. Thus in my considered view, the gravity and seriousness of allegations with likelihood of petitioner tampering with the prosecution evidence and even absconding being there, no ground for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner (Surender @ Kallu) in case FIR No.315 dated 21.05.2020, registered under Sections 302, 364, 201 and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Ballabhgarh, District Faridabad; is dismissed.”

3. In view of this, learned counsel makes a limited prayer that trial be concluded at the earliest.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel informs that there are total 26 prosecution witness, out of which, 12 have been examined, and 06 witnesses have been given up. Thus, remaining 08 witnesses would be examined on the next date of hearing.

5. In the factual backdrop of the circumstances, as have been brought to the notice of this Court, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the trial Court to complete the trial expeditiously, preferably, within a period of four months from today.

6. Accordingly, present petition stands disposed of.

Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the Court of Sessions for its further transmission to the trial Court concerned.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 18, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No