

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

CRM-M-38436-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.12.2016

Paramjit Singh @ Pamma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. KPS Virk, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Suresh Kumar.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in FIR No.124 dated 11.12.2013, registered under Sections 379, 411, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station City II, Mansa.

It is contended that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR, nor arrested from the spot. Earlier also, the petitioner has been implicated in as many as nine more FIRs and he has earned acquittal in three such cases. He is in custody since 04.01.2014.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the instant petition on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender. It is informed that the charges have been framed and the matter is now fixed for prosecution evidence.

Heard.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR, nor arrested from the spot; he is in custody since 04.01.2014; he has been acquitted in three FIRs; and no prosecution witness has since been examined, therefore, it can safely be inferred that the conclusion of the trial may take a considerable time; 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 and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

However, anything noticed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.12.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No