



243-2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43107-2023
Date of decision:-02.04.2025

MANJEET @ SITTU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.

Present:- Mr. Jagraj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioners under Section 439 of the Criminal Procedure Code, for grant of regular bail in the following case:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
392	10.04.2022	307, 120-B, 34 IPC and 25 of Arms Act	Barwala, District Hisar

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that it is a no injury case and the petitioner was arrested on 22.04.2022, after completion of investigation challan has already been presented in Court. The petitioner after spending sufficient long time in custody, has since been granted concession of interim bail vide order dated 08.01.2024 and he is regularly appearing in Court, and has not misused the



concession of interim bail. He, as such, prayed for grant of regular bail by confirming the interim bail already granted to him.

3. *Per contra* learned State counsel referring to the reply filed by the State has assailed these arguments and submits that considering the nature and gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve concession of bail, hence prayed for dismissal of the present petition. However, he has not disputed the fact that petitioner has not misused the interim bail and is regularly appearing in trial.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of the prosecution the present case was registered on the complaint of Ashok, stating that on 31.03.2022 petitioner and co-accused Sukhbir @ Dadu demanded ₹20 lacs as ransom from him and when he refused to pay, the assailants with an intent to kill him fired gun shots. Hence the FIR was registered. Consequently, petitioner was arrested on 22.04.2022 and after completion of investigation challan has already been presented in Court. Admittedly, the petitioner has already been granted concession of interim bail vide order dated 08.01.2024 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench and, it is not disputed that the petitioner is regularly appearing in the trial, and the conclusion of trial to ascertain criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner will take sufficient long time.

5. Keeping in view the fact that after being granted interim bail by Co-ordinate Bench, petitioner has not misused the same and is regularly appearing in the learned trial Court, in these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted to the

petitioner vide order dated 08.01.2024 is hereby confirmed, the present petition is allowed with the direction to the petitioner to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

7. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

02.04.2025

Gyan	i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
	ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No