

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

222

**CRM-M-8757-2020
Date of Decision : 04.03.2020**

Jashdeep Singh @ Ronak @ Jasdeep SinghPetitioners

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, D.A.G. Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.132 dated 16.12.2019 registered under Sections 392, 399, 402 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sanaur, District Patiala.

The above-said FIR was registered on the basis of secret information that accused-Jashdeep Singh (petitioner), Paramveer Singh, Abhishek Kumar, Akashdeep Sharma, Yuvraj Singh, Malkit Singh and Arjun Singh armed with deadly weapons were preparing to commit dacoity in the vacant plots of Green Well Colony, Sanaor and that the above-said persons had earlier committed many such heinous crimes. Raid was accordingly conducted and accused-Jashdeep Singh (petitioner) and Akashdeep Sharma, besides two other persons who were juveniles, were apprehended by the police on the spot. Sword was allegedly recovered from possession of the petitioner. On completion of investigation, charge-sheet has been filed against accused-Jashdeep Singh (petitioner) and his co-accused Akashdeep Sharma. The petitioner being in custody since 16.12.2019 has sought grant of regular bail.

Learned State Counsel has appeared and opposed the
petition.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The prosecution version is highly doubtful. No independent witness was joined at the time of raid. Trial is likely to take long time and no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody. Therefore, the petitioner may be ordered to be released on regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious. In view of gravity of accusation, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, period of his custody and the fact that adjudication of his guilt or innocence on the basis of evidence to be produced during the trial is likely to take long time and that his further detention in custody, not being punitive, will not serve any useful purpose but without commenting 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 regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

However, the petitioner is granted regular bail subject to the condition that after release on bail he shall not commit any similar offence and in case of commission of similar offence by him in future his bail in the present case shall also be liable to be cancelled on application to be filed in this regard.

04.03.2020

Kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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