

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

CRM-M-9384-2020

Date of decision:6.3.2020

AMARJIT SINGH @ AMAR SANDHU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Jaiteshwar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.06 dated 16.1.2019 at Police Station Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib under Sections 379-B, 323, 201, 506 and 34 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, wherein offences under Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act were deleted later on.
2. The allegations, as per FIR, are that the complainant had taken lift in a vehicle in which 4 persons were sitting and that the said persons instead of dropping the complainant at the place where he wished to be dropped, robbed him off valuables including a gold chain, a gold bracelet, a bag containing ₹2.20 lakhs cash etc.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has

falsely been implicated in the present case and that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and even is not named in the FIR and came to be nominated as an accused on the basis of statement of Ex-Sarpanch, who had allegedly seen him. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the FIR has been lodged against the unknown and till today no identification parade has been conducted by the police.

4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted the petitioner has specifically nominated on the basis of disclosure statement, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has however submitted that the petitioner has been behind bars since last more than one year.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Without commenting anything as regards veracity of allegations levelled against the petitioner and while noticing that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last more than one year, further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time.
6. The petition, as such, is accepted and it is ordered that the petitioner be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

6.3.2020
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No

