

216

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

**CRM-M No. 14465 of 2017
Date of Decision: 03.05.2017**

Charanjit Singh @ Sukh

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Jupinder Pal Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Additional A.G., Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No. 284 dated 06.10.2016, under Sections 420/406/120-B I.P.C., registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar.

The FIR was registered at the instance of Maninder Kaur against Rakesh Kumar, Gurdeep Singh, Lakhvir Kumar and Charanjit Singh, i.e. the present petitioner, with the allegations that the complainant wanted to go abroad and accused Gurdeep Singh was known to her brother Harjot Singh,

on whose assurance, the understanding was made and thereafter, Gurdeep Singh also introduced Lakhvir Kumar and Rakesh Kumar to them and it was settled that the complainant would pay an amount of Rs. 15 Lacs in total for sending her abroad. The complainant further alleged that on 25.08.2016, she along with her brother Harjot Singh visited the office of the accused, where all the four accused persons were sitting and paid an amount of Rs. 7 Lacs to Lakhvir Kumar. The remaining amount of Rs. 8 Lacs was paid to all the accused persons in the office of R.K. Overseas.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the present case has necessary connectivity with the case arising out of FIR No. 83 dated 08.10.2016, where the present instance was cited, in order to show the complicity of the complainant party in collusion with her brother Harjot Singh. The petitioner was granted bail in FIR No. 83 vide order dated 05.04.2017. In the present case, at the time of handing over an amount of Rs. 7 Lacs, only the presence of the petitioner was shown. The remaining amount was allegedly paid to all the four accused persons without making any specific entrustment to any of the accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that the case is triable by the Magistrate.

The petitioner is in custody since 06.10.2016.

Learned State counsel on instructions from A.S.I. Manohar Lal submitted that the case is fixed for framing of charges on 08.05.2017.

At this stage, without adverting to the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

May 03, 2017.

Apurva

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No