

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

**CRM-M No.27342 of 2018
Date of decision : 13.09.2018**

Bikramjit Singh alias Bikka

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to petitioner Bikramjit Singh alias Bikka in case FIR No.68 dated 18.05.2018 under Sections 307, 379, 353, 186, 225, 506, 279, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short – IPC) and Section 21(1) of the Mines and Minerals Act, 1957, registered at Police Station Beas, Amritsar Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case, whereas he was not involved. Even as per the allegations in the FIR, no offence under Section 307 IPC is made out. It has been alleged in the FIR that accused persons were asked to stop the tractor and instead of stopping it, the driver tried to run over the police party with intention to kill. Learned counsel further submits that the recovery has already been effected and challan has been presented in the

Court. Petitioner is in custody since 18.05.2018 and no purpose would be served by keeping him in custody.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the custody period undergone by the petitioner and also the stage of the trial. However, she opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the intention of the petitioner was such that he had not only tried to avoid his arrest but tried to cause injury to the police officials, however they saved themselves.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel. I have also perused the contents of the FIR and other documents available on record.

By considering that the petitioner is in custody since 18.05.2018 and keeping in view the fact that there is no other case against him, challan has been presented and there is no possibility that the petitioner may influence the prosecution witnesses as all the prosecution witnesses are police officials and recovery has already been effected, no purpose would be served by keeping him in custody, present petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

13.09.2018

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No