

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-4574 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision :21.5.2020

Mandeep Singh @ Bunty

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present : Mr.Gopal Singh Nahel, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. H.S.Sullar, DAG, Punjab

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner prays for grant of bail pending trial in a criminal case arising from FIR No.181 dated 9.8.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of Travel Professions Regulation Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar.

The gist of the case of the prosecution has been noticed in para 6 of the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, which is extracted as under:-

“6. From the perusal of the Judicial file this court finds that this case was registered at the complaint of Major Singh son of Tara Singh. This complaint was thoroughly investigated by Amandeep Singh Brar, PPS, DSP (Major Crime), Jalandhar (Rural). During inquiry it was found that complainant had settled

with accused Jagroop Singh and Mandeep Singh for sending his son Gursewak Singh to England. Complainant's son Gursewak Singh out of his account had given Rs.2,96,000/- to Jagroop Singh and Rs. 3,65,000/- to Mandeep Singh. As such, Rs.6,63,000/- was paid to the accused and for the remaining amount 2 blank cheques were also issued to the said Travel Agents. After getting money the above said Travel Agents sent Gursewak Singh to Thailand instead of England. When the complaint was moved by the complainant, accused returned back a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant but remaining amount of Rs.6,13,000/- was usurped by them.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 10.8.2019. Investigations are complete. He further submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has submitted that charge was framed on 17.1.2020, however, the evidence of the prosecution witnesses is yet to be recorded.

The petitioner is in custody for last more than 9 months. Conclusion of the trial is likely to take time. As per the information supplied by the learned counsel for the State, the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the aforesaid facts, it is considered appropriate to release the petitioner on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Petition stands allowed.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

21.5.2020
rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No