

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2731-2017

Date of decision : 30.03.2017

Gurdev Singh @ Gaba

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.J.S.Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Rajesh Mehta, Addl.A.G.Punjab

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the order of this Court dated 20.03.2017, it was noticed that the complainant, Bodh Raj, is to be cross-examined on 28.03.2017 and consequently this matter had been adjourned till today. However, the complainant was still not cross-examined on that date, which learned State counsel states is on account of the fact that an application has been filed by the prosecution seeking to place on record certain call details and CCTV footage.

Learned counsel for the petitioner thereafter draws attention to the fact that the alleged victim, i.e. Mohinder Kumar, was throughout in touch with his wife telephonically, but thereafter (as alleged), an offence under Section 364-A IPC was added.

Obviously, the petitioner having been in custody since June 2016 and the trial nowhere near completion as yet, he also being a

permanent resident of the State itself, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is willing to furnish adequately 'heavy' bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

Considering the aforesaid circumstances, but without making any comment on the merits of the case, which would be obviously appraised by the learned trial Court on the basis of evidence led before it, I consider it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail, upon his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds of an adequate amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

March 30, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

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