

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M-3154 of 2015
Date of Decision:-23.3.2015**

Charanjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate and
Mr. Kartik Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, Deputy A.G., Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA J.

Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate submits that he be permitted to withdraw his power of attorney in this case as the party has engaged Mr. Kartik Gupta, Advocate.

On his request, the power of attorney filed by him earlier is ordered to be withdrawn.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed the present petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.92 dated 10.6.2013, on accusation of having committed the offences punishable under Sections 436, 427, 148 and 149 IPC, registered at Police Station City, Hoshiarpur.

Notice of the petition was issued to the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the case of the petitioner is similar to that of CRM No. M-2345 of 2015, decided on 4.2.2015, titled 'Sanjiv Kumar vs. The State of Punjab', wherein the similarly placed accused has been granted regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 8.7.2013 i.e the date of his arrest and no useful purpose would be served to further detain him in jail. He further states that not even a single witness has been examined so far by the prosecution, so, final conclusion of the trial will take long time.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Manbir does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

In the light of the aforesaid reasons and taking into consideration the totality of the facts and circumstances, particularly when the other co-accused has already been admitted to regular bail by this Court in CRM No. M-2345 of 2015 the instant petition for regular bail is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Needless to mention that nothing observed, here-in-above, would reflect on merits of the main case, in any manner, during the course of trial, as the same has been recorded for a limited purpose of deciding the present petition for regular bail.

March 23, 2015
Vijay Asija

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE