

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

**CRM-M-49399-2017 (O&M)**

**Date of decision:08.02.2018**

Narinderjit Singh @ Billa

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present: Mr. Sarbjit Singh Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

...

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).**

Petitioner seeks benefit of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No.38, dated 14.03.2017, under Sections 382/392/34 IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act (Offence under Section 307 IPC added subsequently), registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Laddi Ram. It was asserted that the complainant was working with the owner of one Durga Car Palace, Patran . On the date of occurrence i.e. on 14.03.2017, three unidentified clean shaven persons aged 23-24 years had come to the car palace and had shown interest to buy a Verna car bearing registration No. PB-65-R-1521. Thereafter, owner of the car palace had handed over the key of the car to the complainant with the direction to accompany the three young persons so as to take a trial run of the car. Precise allegations are that under the threat of a fire arm, the car was taken away as also the mobile phone having two sim cards and cash amount of Rs.1100/-. Further

allegation is that a shot was also fired by the assailants and which hit the complainant on his left arm.

As per prosecution version, the vehicle in question has been recovered from co-accused Sukhchain Singh @ Sukhi. The present petitioner is sought to be implicated on the disclosure statement of co-accused Sukhchain Singh @ Sukhi.

Learned State counsel would otherwise concede that the petitioner is not involved in any other case of a similar nature.

Investigation in the case is complete, challan already stands presented.

Petitioner has faced incarceration since 01.06.2017.

Trial would take time to conclude.

In the considered view of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody till the conclusion of the trial.

Without making any observations on merit, petitioner is held entitled to the benefit of bail.

Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to satisfaction of the Trial Court /Duty Magistrate concerned.

Disposed of.

08.02.2018

*harjeet*

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)  
JUDGE

- |     |                            |        |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable?        | Yes/No |