

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

(i) CRM No.M-13878 of 2017 (O&M)

Gurpreet Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-16770 of 2017 (O&M)

Gurjant Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: August 16, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.B.S.Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-13878 of 2017).

Mr.H.P.S.Ihsar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-16770 of 2017).

Mr.Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr.DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as the same have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.23 dated 18.03.2017 under Section 3(vi) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act,1976,

registered at Police Station City Mansa, District Mansa.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners argued that the allegations are mainly against owners of the concerned brick kiln, who have since been arrested. Learned counsel for petitioner Gurjant Singh argued that name of petitioner Gurjant Singh does not figure in the FIR and he has been roped being the partner in the brick kiln run by co-accused. Whereas, learned counsel for petitioner Gurpreet Singh argued that Gurpreet Singh has been named in the FIR by the complainant party, only to rope in the family of co-accused Jasvir Singh, since the petitioner Gurpreet Singh is his son.

The petitioners have already joined the investigation. They are not required for custodial interrogation. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioners are entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, both the petitions are accepted and the order dated 25.04.2017 passed in CRM No.M-13878 of 2017 and order dated 11.05.2017 passed in CRM No.M-16770 of 2017, granting interim bail to the petitioners, are made absolute.

August 16, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No