

135+215

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

**CRM No.13975 of 2017 in/and
CRM-M No.12178 of 2017
Date of Decision: 27.04.2017**

Narinder Singh Randhawa

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. H. C. Arora, Advocate
for the complainant.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

CRM No.13975 of 2017

Through this application filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,
impleadment of the complainant/applicant as respondent No.2, is sought
for.

After going through the contents of the application and
hearing learned counsel for the parties, the present application is allowed
and the complainant is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.
Amended memo of parties annexed with the application is ordered to be
taken on record.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M No.12178 of 2017

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C.,

the petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in FIR No.24, dated 15.03.2017, registered under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, at Police Station Sadar Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.03.2017; he has been falsely implicated in this case; he is a senior citizen being 62 years of age; retired as Sub-Inspector of Border Security Force; has successfully managed a number of schools and colleges since 1988 and that the alleged misappropriated salary amount of the complainant of Rs.8000/- has already been released to her.

Learned State counsel as also learned counsel for the complainant oppose the grant of bail on the ground that there is a case pending against the petitioner alleging sexual harassment, hurting religious sentiments and child labour and that since the petitioner is an influential person, if enlarged on bail, he would tamper with the evidence especially when the challan has yet to be filed.

Countering the above arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the case filed against the petitioner for sexual harassment, hurting religious sentiments and child labour, he has already been granted anticipatory bail vide orders dated 30.03.2017 and that the petitioner undertakes not to tamper with any evidence.

After considering the rival submissions of the parties, I am of the view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in jail especially when this particular case pertains to the allegations regarding misappropriation of one month's salary of the complainant which admittedly has already been released. So far as the case against the

petitioner with regard to the sexual harassment, hurting religious sentiments and child labour is concerned, the same is at the initial stage and thus, should not be commented upon especially when in the same, the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Faridkot.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

So far as the apprehension expressed by the learned State counsel as also learned counsel for the complainant with regard to the petitioner tampering with the evidence or pressurizing the witnesses is concerned, no such instance has been brought to my notice as on date but in case the petitioner is found indulging in the above, it would always be open to the State/complainant to move this Court for withdrawal of the concession so granted to the petitioner by this order.

April 27, 2017
rittu

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

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