

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

CRM-M-7533-2020

Date of decision: 26.2.2020

SUKHDEV SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present: Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.45 dated 2.5.2019 under Sections 382/34 IPC at Police Station Dhakoli, District SAS Nagar.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Jeenu Verma wife of Rakesh Verma wherein it has been alleged that on the date of occurrence when she was present at her home, the door bell rang and when her son opened the door, one person came inside followed by three more persons and who while brandishing weapons took away cash amount of ₹3.5 lakhs and gold ornaments.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case on account of the fact that there were some

commercial transactions between the petitioner and husband of the complainant and that subsequently differences amongst the complainant and the petitioner were resolved and the complainant's husband had also furnished an affidavit which is duly referred to in order dated 14.11.2019 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, SAS Nagar Mohlai.

4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that in the present case, there is CCTV footage showing the presence of co-accused Harman Singh and that the said Harman Singh later identified the petitioner and disclosed his name. It has further been submitted that the complainant in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. had reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR and even if subsequently parties had entered into compromise the same would be of no significance. It has however been informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since last more than 8 months and that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.
5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and without commenting on merits of the case and while bearing in mind the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars since last 8 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time.
6. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is clarified that this order shall enure offences under Sections 392, 395, 473, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act which are stated to have been added later on.

**26.2.2020**  
Gaurav Sorot

**( GURVINDER SINGH GILL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned / speaking?      **Yes / No**

Whether reportable?      **Yes / No**