

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.39233 of 2017
Date of Decision.30.10.2017

Charanjit Singh alias Prince

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

The petitioner is incarcerated in jail since 27.07.2017 in respect of FIR bearing No.555 dated 14.07.2017 under Sections 408, 420, 411, 120-B IPC and Sections 13, 13-A of Gambling Act, 1867 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Karnal, which was registered by Sandeep Kumar, Deputy Manager in Secure Value India Ltd. making allegations against Kapil Kumar son of Sant Lal, resident of House No.418, Street No.9, Gandhi Nagar, Karnal and Ravinder Kumar son of Rajender Singh, resident of Kalsaura, Karnal.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in the supplementary statement recorded on 27.07.2017 i.e. almost 13 days after registration of the FIR, the petitioner's name i.e. Charanjit Singh @ Prince was disclosed and the role attributed to him was that he had accompanied the main accused to Delhi for the purpose of gambling.

Learned counsel for the State submits that once name of the petitioner has been disclosed in the supplementary statement on the basis of

been recovered, challan has been filed in that regard, even charges have been framed, the petitioner can prove his innocence by cross-examining the prosecution witnesses, therefore, is not entitled to concession of regular bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and appraised the paper book. The supplementary statement was recorded 13 days after the occurrence wherein the following allegations have been made against the petitioner:-

“.....Charanjit Singh alias Prince son of Shri Baljit Singh, Caste Ramgarhiya Sikh, resident of Ram Nagar, Karnal and Kapil, Ravinder, Mandeep, Parven along with many other persons name not known, had gone to Delhi in the intervening night of 10/11.7.17 for gambling.”

Without going into the merits and demerits of the case, which will be subject to the evidence brought on record by the Prosecutor and the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to grant regular bail to the petitioner. Resultantly, the crl. petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate, Karnal.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 30, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes

Whether reportable No