

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

222

**CRM-M No. 220 of 2020
Date of decision : 28.01.2020**

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. C.L.Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kaundal, DAG, Punjab
for respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI,J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present (first) petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 120 dated 10.06.2019 registered under Sections 452, 323, 379-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar to which Section 392 of the IPC has been added lateron.

The petitioner Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi has been charge-sheeted by SHO, Police Station Rama Mandi, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar for alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 452, 323, 379-B read with Section 34 of the IPC to which Section 392 of the IPC has been added lateron on the allegations that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused armed with deadly weapons had trespassed into the office of the E-Conroe Courier Company, abused and inflicted blow with iron rod on left hand of complainant Amandeep, Dealing Assistant in the presence of supervisor Sukhpreet Singh and snatched amount of Rs. 2,93,000/- and their

mobile phones.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. The petitioner was not named in the FIR and was implicated and arrested on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Prince Baba. He was not involved in the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 05.08.2019. The trial is likely to take long time. His similarly placed co-accused Nav Ketan and Ashish Sandhu have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.12.2019 and 08.01.2020 respectively. Therefore, the petitioner may be ordered to be released on regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has submitted that the offences attributed to the petitioner are of serious nature and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case particularly that involvement of the petitioner in the alleged occurrence is disputed, the trial is likely to take long time, parity of the petitioner with his similarly placed co-accused Nav Ketan and Ashish Sandhu who have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.12.2019 and 08.01.2020 respectively but without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, in case of commission of any offence of similar nature by the petitioner in future, his bail in the present case shall also be liable to be cancelled on filing of application in this regard.

28.01.2020

Rajeev (rvs)

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE**