

**IN THE COURT OF SANDEEP KUMAR DUGGAL, ADDL. SESSIONS  
JUDGE, ROHTAK**

|                      |              |
|----------------------|--------------|
| CIS No               | 1799 of 2016 |
| Bail application No. | 28 of 2016   |
| Date of Institution: | 04.02.2016   |
| Date of Order:       | 06.02.2016   |

Jagbir @ Kala Son of Balwan R/o Village Majra Piyao, Tehsil Narnaund, Distt.  
Hissar.

-----Applicant/petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana.

FIR No.131 dated 02.05.2014  
Under sections: 395/397 IPC & 25,54,59 of Arms Act  
Police Station: Meham

**IST APPLICATION FOR REGULAR BAIL U/S 439 OF CR. P.C.**

Present: Shri R.R. Nain, counsel for the applicant .  
Sh. Fateh Chand, Public Prosecutor for the State.

**O R D E R:**

This order of mine, shall dispose of the first application for bail filed under Section 439 Cr. PC on behalf of applicant-accused through his counsel in case FIR No 131 dated 02.05.2014 under Section 395, 397 IPC & 25/54/59 Arms Act, Police Station Meham.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the complainant Deepak has moved an application to the effect on 01.05.2014 at about 12.30 p.m he along with his father had proceeded from Delhi Airport to Fatehabad on their RITZ silver colour car bearing no HR 22J-4949. At about 2.30 P.M when they reached near village Madina, one ECO vehicle was stopped in front of their car. One Sumo was also stopped behind their car. Two boys from the Sumo and two boys from the ECO vehicle came out and took the keys of their car. One boy pointed a pistol on his father and seated him on the rear seat. They snatched valuable articles as Rs 650/-, licence, PAN Card, ATM, Mobile, Rs 25,000/- and their car from them. Hence the present FIR.

3. Notice of the bail application was given to the Public Prosecutor for the State. Reply has been filed and opposed the bail application. Learned Public Prosecutor has argued that from the possession of applicant-accused, the looted car RITZ No. HR22J-4949 was got recovered and the weapon of offence which has been used in the commission of crime has also been recovered from the applicant in case FIR No. 595 at PS Sadar Hissar and has got been transferred in the present case. So far as, nine other cases of various sections were registered against applicant. Therefore, learned Public Prosecutor has requested for dismissal of bail application.

4. On the other hand learned counsel for the applicant-accused has argued that complainant and other witnesses have become hostile. Therefore, there is no eye version against him. It has been further submitted that in all the cases registered against him, he has been falsely implicated. It has been further submitted that he is on

bail in all other cases except present one. Nothing has been recovered from him. He is in custody since 01.07.2014. Therefore, learned counsel has prayed for the allowing the present bail application.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant-accused, learned Public Prosecutor for the State and have gone through the case file.

6. After looking into the antecedent and facts and circumstances of the present case, I deem it proper not to grant the concession of bail to the present applicant-accused. Accordingly, his bail application is hereby dismissed. Papers be tagged with main case file.

Announced in open Court.  
Dated: 06.02.2016

(Sandeep Kumar Duggal)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Rohtak

This order contains three pages and all the  
pages have been checked and signed by me.

(Sandeep Kumar Duggal)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Rohtak.

Jagbir            vs.            State

Present:        Shri R.R. Nain, counsel for the applicant .  
                    Sh. Fateh Chand, Public Prosecutor for the State.

Arguments heard. Vide my statement of even date, present bail application is hereby dismissed. Papers be tagged with main case file.

Announced in open Court.  
Dated: 06.02.2016

(Sandeep Kumar Duggal)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Rohtak