

CRM-M-37851-2015

Date of Decision : 09.05.2016

Dharam Chand @ Maisi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI**Present:** Mr. Amaninder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, D.A.G, Punjab.

M.M.S. BEDI, JUDGE (ORAL)

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and State counsel, it appears that it is not a case of direct evidence against the petitioner. The petitioner has been in custody with effect from 19.07.2014 and arrayed as an accused on the basis of certain circumstantial evidence and motive that deceased Gurpreet Singh had relations with one Poonam and petitioner along with other accused Vinod used to threaten him to break relationships.

Petitioner has been involved in the case on the basis of circumstantial evidence regarding the recoveries of articles etc. It appears that on the basis of certain phone call details of the petitioner and the deceased, he stands indicted in the case. Circumstantial evidence no doubt is a weak type of evidence but avoiding entering into the niceties of the trial at this stage, taking into consideration the fact that only one witness out of 21, has been examined, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this petition at this stage with a direction to the trial Court to make earnest endeavour to record the statements of all the

prosecution witnesses within a period of five months and conclude the trial within a period of six months from the next date of hearing. In case the case is not decided within a period of six months after the next date of hearing, the trial Court shall release the petitioner on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to its satisfaction.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

09.05.2016
Neha