

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-266 of 2015 (O&M).
Decided on:-July 14, 2015.

Satwinder Singh.Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

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

Present:- Mr. Jatin Khullar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Raman Gokliney, Advocate for the complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in the cross version in FIR No.306 dated 14.10.2014 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Ferozepur during pendency of the trial.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been impersonated and on the basis of forged driving licence, the bank account was operated. He further submits that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Swaran Singh @ Malli has already been granted regular bail by this Court in CRM-M No.9479 of 2015 vide order dated 29.5.2015. He further states that though the charge has been framed but the offences are triable by

the Magistrate and the trial is likely to take sufficient long time.

Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the bail application and submits that the petitioner is the person who is beneficiary in this case as money has gone in his bank account.

Similarly, learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Naveen Kumar, states that money has gone in his bank account and allegations against him are serious in nature.

Considering the fact that the offences are triable by the Magistrate and the trial is likely to take sufficient long time and in view of the law laid down in *Sanjay Chandra Versus C.B.I. 2011(4) RCR (Criminal) 896 (SC)*, this Court finds that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted on regular bail subject to his furnishing of bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court or any other condition which the trial Court may deem fit and proper under the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

However, the petitioner would not interfere with the trial or tamper with the investigation, in any manner. In case the petitioner interfere or tamper with the evidence, the complainant shall be at liberty to approach the trial Court for cancellation of bail.

Needless to say that the observations made hereinabove shall

not be construed as reflection of any opinion on the merits of the main case, in any manner, during the course of trial, as the same have been recorded for a limited purpose of deciding the present petition for regular bail. The trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of availability of evidence.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

July 14, 2015
'Yag Dutt'