

Parmanand Vs. the State of Madhya Pradesh

Parmanand Vs. the State of Madhya Pradesh

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1052020

Court : Madhya Pradesh

Decided On : Feb-27-2013

Appellant : Parmanand

Respondent : The State of Madhya Pradesh

Judgement :

M.Cr.C.No.991/2013 M.Cr.C.No.1138/2013 27.2.2013 Ms.Sudha Pandit, Advocate for the applicants.

Shri Akhilendra Singh, GA for the State.

Shri S.K.Gangrade, Advocate for the objector.

These are the fiRs.bail applications filed by the applicants under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C.for grant of bail.

Applicant Parmanand is in custody since 27.9.2012, applicant Poonam is in custody since 21.10.2012 and applicant Shravan is in custody since 31.10.2012 in connection with Crime No.503/2011 registered at P.S.Harda, District Harda for the offence punishable under Sections 148, 302/149 and 120-B of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the case.

Names of these applicants did not find place in the FIR.

During investigation, some persons like Harnarayan, Shantilal, Ramdas and Ramdayal stated the names of these applicants, however, during trial Harnarayan, Shantilal and Ramdas have not supported the prosecution case and Ramdayal is not claiming himself as an eye witness of the incident of committing murder of Chandu @ Chandra Shekhar.

The applicants are in custody and trial would take considerable time to conclude, therefore, they be released on bail.

Learned counsel for State and objector have opposed the application.

On due consideration of the contention raised by the learned counsel for the parties, statements of aforesaid three witnesses and overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the considered view that it is a fit case to release the applicants on bail, therefore, without expressing any view on the merits of the case, these applications are allowed and it is directed that applicants shall be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond in a sum of Rs.35,000/- (Rs.Thirty Five Thousand only) each with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the committal Court/ trial Court for securing their presence before the said Court on all the dates of hearing fixed in this regard during trial.

Certified copy as per rules.

(G.S.Solanki) Judge PB

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com