

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2224-2018

Date of Decision: January 30, 2018

Gurdev Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CRM-M-2602-2018

Balwinder Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Deepinder Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.A.S. Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

This order will dispose of CRM-M-2224-2018 and CRM-M-2602-2018 as both of them have arisen out of the same FIR No.108 dated 25.08.2017, under Sections 307, 436, 152, 153-A, 148, 149/120B, IPC read with Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, 1959, Sections 3/4 of the Prevention of Damages to Public Property Act, 1984 and Sections 3/4 of Explosive Act No.06 of 1908 registered at Police Station Sadar, Bathinda.

2. The petitioners are followers of Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh. The allegations against them are that Gurdev Singh was made in-charge of Bathinda area for creating violence and arson whereas Balwinder Singh is the person in whose place, a meeting took place before the incident of arson was committed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that Gurdev Singh has been involved on the basis of statement of one Gurwinder Singh whose name does not find mention in the list of witnesses annexed along with the final report. So far as Balwinder Singh is concerned, it is submitted that he has also been involved on the basis of statement of one Janak Raj, whose name is also not mentioned in the list of witnesses. That apart, learned counsel for the petitioners contend that they have been in custody since 25.08.2017 and 05.09.2017 respectively. Investigation is complete and final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented.

4. Learned State counsel however, submits that the names of Gurwinder Singh as well as Janak Raj have been mentioned in the list of witnesses annexed with the final report, but it is not disputed that the investigation is complete

5. In view of the fact that the petitioners would not be able to interfere with the investigation of the case, I deem it appropriate to allow this petition and order their release on bail on their furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Judicial Magistrate at Bathinda.

6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

January 30, 2018

sonia arora

[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No