

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-20405 of 2016

.....

Date of decision:23.8.2016

Angrej Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Chand Deep Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shivali, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab for the
respondent-State.

Mr. Gurnam Singh, Advocate for respondents
No.3 and 4.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C.
for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.129 dated 14.6.2014 (Annexure-P.3)
registered for the offences under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-
B IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Ms. Shivali, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has
put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Gurnam Singh,
learned Advocate has appeared for respondents No.3 and 4 and contested
this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab appearing for the respondent-State and learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4 and have gone through the record.

The petitioner was earlier granted the benefit of regular bail but later on via order dated 18.8.2015 passed by this Court in Criminal Misc. No.M-5949 of 2015 cancelled the bail order of the present petitioner and he was directed to be taken into custody.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has not misled the Court and there was no intention on his part. The petitioner was not the signatory for the compromise. Further more, he argued that the petitioner could not come to know regarding the order dated 18.8.2015 and he continuously remained appearing before the trial Court and, in no way, he has misused the concession of bail. Now the petitioner has been in custody since 14.3.2016. It is also argued that the petitioner earlier also remained in custody for six months before granting the regular bail earlier. It is also argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that main accused has died and the remaining accused are on bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and learned State counsel, I find that the trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody till the final disposal of the case. All the co-accused of the petitioner are on bail. The main accused is stated to have died. The petitioner earlier remained in custody for six months and now also he is in custody for more than five months.

Therefore, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this criminal miscellaneous petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

August 23, 2016.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No