

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

**CRM-M No.1519 of 2019 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 22.02.2019**

Hansa Singh

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**

Present:- Mr. Lakhvinder Singh Dandiwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab  
for the respondent/State.

\*\*\*\*

**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J. (Oral)**

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (*for short 'Cr.P.C.'*) for grant of bail pending trial to the petitioner in case FIR No.122 dated 24.11.2018, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City II, Mansa, District Mansa.

Allegation is regarding the tampering of the Agreement to Sell dated 09.07.2013 in the name of Gurnam Singh.

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that he is in custody since 24.11.2018 and report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been submitted on 21.02.2019 before the Court of competent jurisdiction. Also contended that there are total 15 prosecution witnesses and trial will take a long time for its conclusion. Further contended that petitioner is not involved in any other case.

The above factual position is duly acknowledged by learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhcharan Singh.

Heard both sides and perused the paper-book.

Keeping in view the facts that petitioner is in custody since 24.11.2018; report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been submitted; no other criminal case is pending against the petitioner and there are total 15 prosecution witnesses and thus, trial is likely to take a long time for its conclusion, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to release the petitioner on bail, pending trial.

In view of the abovesaid circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that in case there is recurrence on the part of the petitioner, the prosecution would be at liberty to move an appropriate application before this Court for recalling of this order.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

February 22, 2019  
Gagan

( MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU )  
JUDGE

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes |