

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

CRM-M-1742-2020

Date of decision-22.01.2020

**Wazir Singh @ Piara Singh
Vs.**

...Petitioner

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Wazir Singh @ Piara Singh has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.254 dated 20.11.2018 registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Ferozepur, District Ferozepur. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 12.06.2019.

The present FIR relates to the alleged offence of cheating which was lodged on the basis of statement given by Jagir Singh who had entered into an agreement to sell with Karnail Singh (co-accused) on 10.04.2018. The said deal between the parties was facilitated through co-accused, namely, Balwinder Singh son of Karnail Singh. Pursuant to the said deal, a sum of Rs.84 lacs in all was allegedly paid by complainant and out of it Rs.32 lacs went to the account of Karnail Singh and rest of the amount was allegedly given to other co-accused persons. On these broad allegation, the above FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the dispute is

purely of civil nature as the allegations in the FIR pertain to a transaction based upon agreement to sell between complainant-Jagir Singh and co-accused Karnail Singh. He submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR. He has invited the attention of the Court to Annexure P-2 in respect of co-accused who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. According to him, investigation of case is complete and final report stands filed, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be necessary.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Sukhjinder Singh opposed the prayer. However, this fact is not disputed that co-accused have been granted the concession of regular bail. She has further apprised the Court that the investigation of the case is complete.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be justified, particularly when the investigation of the case is complete. Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

22.01.2020

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No