

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

(220)

CRM-M-4504-2016

Decided on: February 12, 2016.

Narinder Singh @ Ghuddu

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Bhandohal, Advocate, for the complainant.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been involved in a false case as he belongs to non-ruling party and that earlier also a false case had been registered against the petitioner under Section 307 IPC in which later on the cancellation report had been prepared, pursuant to the petitioner having approached this Court for grant of regular bail.

Present case is alleged to have been foisted on the petitioner in connivance with the police to pressurize him to compromise the other cases.

The allegation against the petitioner is that he is responsible for the murder of Harinder Kaur who had been critically injured and thrown in the kitchen of the house.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case.

Learned counsel for the State has contended that on the basis of recovery of a passbook and gas connection copy belonging to the deceased, the petitioner has been involved in the case.

Learned counsel for the complainant has intervened to highlight that co-accused Manjot Singh @ Goldy and Mohd. Irfan @ Mohd Jamal Ansari @ Shanker Arfan had confessed their guilt of having killed the deceased lady. The petitioner is involved in the case on the basis of his statement made to the police.

With the assistance of learned counsel for the complainant and learned State counsel, I have gone through his statement made in the Court. There is not even a word against the petitioner but perusal of the police file indicates that the petitioner has allegedly made extra judicial confession before Manjinder Singh who is none-else but the partner of the complainant in his business.

Taking into consideration the fact that the circumstantial evidence appears to be weak in nature and petitioner being not involved in any other case of dacoity etc, he can be granted concession of bail.

Petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing said in this order will prejudice the right of the prosecution agency during course of trial.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

February 12, 2016
harsha