

229

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

CRM-M-5851-2020

Date of decision-17.02.2020

Prince @ Ranjha

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Achin Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Prince @ Ranjha has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.152 dated 08.07.2019 registered under Section 304 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City, Faridkot, District Faridkot. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 05.08.2019.

The FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Sandeep Singh Gill son of Sampuran Singh wherein it was stated that complainant's son was a drug addict. The complainant used to stop him from consuming drugs and he also got him admitted in Drug De-Addiction Centre. On 07.07.2019, at about 3.15 p.m., Prince @ Ranjha (petitioner) and

one unknown person came to the house of the complainant and took away his son with them. Complainant's son did not return home till 7.15 p.m.. Upon search, son of the complainant was found lying unconscious near the Wall of Agricultural Farm, thereafter, he was declared dead. On these broad allegations FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the victim died of over dose of drugs, who was a drug addict. He submits that the FIR itself contains the fact that the victim was got admitted in Drug De-Addiction Centre by the complainant. According to him, the FIR is founded on suspicion alone. He further submits that investigation of the case is complete, therefore, further custody of the petitioner is not necessary. Learned counsel has further placed reliance upon Annexures P-2 and P-3 in respect of co-accused who have already been extended the concession of regular bail by this Court.

On the contrary, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Shailender Singh has opposed the prayer on the ground that the petitioner is named in the FIR, however, it is not disputed that the investigation of the case is complete. It is also not disputed that co-accused have been granted the concession of regular bail. She has further apprised the Court that three prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 11 witnesses and the case is fixed for 29.02.2020 before the trial Court.

Considering the above background and custody of the petitioner, this Court does not find any reason to further detain the petitioner

behind the bars as the trial is likely to consume considerable time. 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

17.02.2020
vanita

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