

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No.M-24749 of 2016

Date of Decision: 27.09.2016

Saraj Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present:- Ms. Harpinder Kaur Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.119 dated 12.5.2015 under Sections 420, 489A, 489B, 489C, 489D, 489E IPC registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 12.5.2015 and there is no other case against him except the present one. He further submits that co-accused of the petitioner namely Harpreet Singh @ Raju has already been admitted on regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-16723-2016 *Harpreet Singh @ Raju v. State of Punjab* decided on 12.7.2016.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kamaljit Singh, submits that no doubt, co-accused Harpreet Singh has been released on regular bail, but the role attributed to him is different, as he had taken lift from the present petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 12.5.2015 and trial in the case will take long time, as prosecution evidence has yet not been started and only charge has been framed, coupled with the fact that the petitioner is not facing any other case of similar nature, I deem it appropriate to release the petitioner on regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted on regular bail subject to furnishing of his bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court and in case, he possesses a passport, he will surrender the same before the trial Court.

It is further made clear that the petitioner shall not indulge in any other case of similar nature and in case he is found to have been indulged in such like case, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

Needless to say that expression made hereinabove shall not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case.

September 27, 2016
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No