



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

224

**CRM-M-225-2025
Decided on: January 14, 2025**

Raja Hudda @ Raja Hooda**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Kapish Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Raja Hudda @ Raja Hooda s/o Brajpal	122	10.04.2023	120-B, 302, 307, 34 IPC and Sections 25/29 of Arms Act (Sections 148, 149, 202 & 216 IPC added later on)	Murthal	Sonipat

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that four of the accused, namely, (1) Vipin, (2) Daulat Ram, (3) Sumit @ Monu, and (4) Ravinder @ Bhinda, have already been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Claiming parity with co-accused – Vipin and Sumit @ Monu, in particular, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that



present petitioner – Raja Hudda @ Raja Hooda is also entitled for grant of bail.

4. On advance notice, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, has put in appearance and points out that, in fact, present petitioner belongs to Meerut (Uttar Pradesh), and he is already involved in one more criminal case for committing the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC, in District Meerut. Also submits that the allegation against the petitioner is of firing shot upon the deceased, which proved fatal. The motorcycle used, one country-made pistol and one live cartridge were also recovered from him.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court notices the fact that in para 6 of the order dated 03.12.2024 (at Page 38 of the paper book, Annexure P-5), passed by co-ordinate Bench of this Court it is observed that in the FIR, complainant had expressed his strong suspicion against Sumit @ Monu and Vipin.

6. Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

7. Dismissed as withdrawn.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

January 14, 2025
Pkapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**