

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

**CRM-M No. 9460 of 2018
Date of Decision:-12.03.2018**

Manbir Singh @ Sabhi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner points to the fact that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor in the statements or supplementary statements of the father of one of the deceased, nor by the complainant, Daman Mahajan, or the eye witness Inderbir Singh. It is only upon the disclosure statement of a co-accused, that an allegation has been made against him that the petitioner's mobile was used to ring up another co-accused.

Of course learned counsel for the petitioner denies that the mobile belongs to the petitioner.

Learned State counsel submits that as a matter of fact the whole occurrence is the result on account of a “gang war” and the complainant even had to come to this Court to get an FIR registered.

Having considered the aforesaid arguments, in view of the fact

that the petitioner has not been named either by the complainant or any of the affected victims or their families, but only by a co-accused, he having been in custody for the last 8-½ months, as per the custody certificate filed in the Court today by learned State counsel, with the trial still at its absolute early stage, I consider it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail, on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

The petition stands allowed.

March 12, 2018
Vijay Asija/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No