

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

CRM-M-20879 of 2015

Date of decision : 09.07.2015

Pindi alias Sukhjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH

1. Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. G.L. Bajaj Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Jashanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

DARSHAN SINGH, J (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed by petitioner Pindi alias Sukhjit Singh under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.60 dated 02.04.2014, under Sections 392, 394 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter called the IPC) (Sections 397 & 398 IPC added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

2. As per the prosecution allegations, the present petitioner along with his co-accused snatched a bag containing Rs.4500/- from complainant Nandan Singh @ Mohinder Singh in the presence of

Harbhan Singh and also caused injuries to the them. The petitioner was arrested in this case on 02.04.2014. Since then, he is in custody. Hence this petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year. The material witnesses of the prosecution i.e. the complainant and eye witness of the occurrence have not supported the prosecution case. The conclusion of the trial will take time. So, he deserves the concession of regular bail. He also contended that co-accused Kamaldeep Singh @ Tetu and Kirandeep Singh alias Mahna have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

4. On the other hand learned State counsel pleaded that the present petitioner has played active role in the occurrence. His name also figures in the FIR. So, he does not deserves the concession of regular bail.

5. I have duly considered the aforesaid contentions.

6. The petitioner has placed on file the copy of the statements of complainant and Harbhan Singh, the witness of occurrence. Both of them have not supported the prosecution version and have not identified the present petitioner as a culprit. This fact is also not disputed that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year. His further detention will not serve any purpose.

7. Thus, without expressing anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner Pindi alias

Sukhjit Singh is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing requisite bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

09.07.2015

sunil yadav

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**