

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

CRM-M-29125 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision : 07.09.2015

Jarnail Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, DAG, Punjab
assisted with ASI Jagtar Singh

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'the Cr.P.C.') seeking regular bail in case FIR No.93 dated 07.08.2013, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Bilga, Jalandhar City.

The learned counsel, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has just stood the guarantor in the loan case of Jagmohan Singh. He further submits that out of 17 witnesses, three witnesses have been examined and co-accused Nirmal Singh has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.07.2015.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

bail and states that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused have availed the loan from the bank on the basis for forged revenue documents. However, the learned State counsel admits the factum that out of 17 witnesses, three witnesses have been examined. He further submits that six other cases have also been registered against the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

The petitioner is in custody since 29.08.2013 and the co-accused has been admitted to bail by this Court in CRM-M-23343 of 2015, therefore, it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future.

In view of above, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of the trial, on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.09.2015

ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE