

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

CRM-M-40625 of 2017 (O&M)
Decided on:-December 11, 2017.

Manjit Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present:- Mr. H.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Deepak Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(ORAL)

CRM-38432-2017

This is an application filed under Section 482 Cr.PC for placing
on record the copy of civil suit dated 03.01.2015 as Annexure P-4.

The document Annexure P-4 is taken on record subject to all just
exceptions.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-40625-2017

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant
of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.19 dated 06.02.2013
under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station
City Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2013 and conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time as only 9 witnesses have been examined so far against the cited 15 prosecution witnesses. He further states that though another FIR No.134 dated 22.06.2012 under Sections 303, 302, 212, 213, 201, 216, 174-A, 380, 420, 403, 424, 467 and 120-B IPC is registered against the petitioner at Police Station City Sri Muktsar Sahib, but in that case, the petitioner has been admitted on bail by this Court vide order dated 22.09.2017 passed in ***CRM-M-34045 of 2017*** titled as ***Manjit Singh Versus State of Punjab***.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has tried to justify the custody of the petitioner by arguing that since the petitioner is involved in aforesaid FIR No.134, wherein though he has been admitted on bail by this Court, but it does not entitle the petitioner to be released on bail in this case.

Learned State counsel concurs with the arguments so advanced by learned counsel for the complainant.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

There is no dispute that the petitioner is in custody in this case since 12.02.2013. The offences are triable by Magistrate and as on date, the petitioner is in custody for the last around 4 years and 10 months. Therefore, in these facts and circumstances and in view of the law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Sanjay Chandra Versus CBI (2012) 1 SCC 40***, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. Since the petitioner is involved in another case, the trial

Court may put any other reasonable condition, as it deems fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

December 11, 2017
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No