

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

CRM M-12984 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: June 08, 2020

(1) GulabdeenPetitioner
Versus
State of Haryana Respondent

CRM M-13011 of 2020 (O&M)

(2) GulabdeenPetitioner
Versus
State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present : Mr. T.N. Attariwala, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Baljinder Virk, DAG, Haryana.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM 11294-2020 and
CRM 11303 of 2020

The matter has been taken up through
video-conferencing on account of outbreak of pandemic COVID-
19.

Heard.

In the light of the averments in the applications, the same are allowed subject to all just exceptions.

**CRM M-12984 of 2020 and
CRM M-13011 of 2020**

Notice of the applications.

Mr. Baljinder Virk, DAG, Haryana puts in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the State. Let copy of the complete paper books be supplied to him.

The above mentioned first two regular bail applications both of accused/petitioner Gulabdeen having arisen though in different FIR bearing No.648 dated 06.02.2020 registered under Sections 135, 138 and 151 and No. 582 dated 30.01.2020 registered under Sections 135, 138 and 150 of Indian Electricity Act at Police Station, Irrigation and Power, Karnal, District Karnal but on account of connectivity of facts are being taken up together for disposal.

The allegations in brief are that electricity meters installed in the premises in the name of Ajmer Singh son of Daya Chand and Vedpal son of Prithvi Singh were checked through LL1 No.4392/22 dated 03.02.2020 and LL1 No. 1125/9 dated 17.01.2020, respectively, who happen to be the consumers and were apprehended committing theft of electricity

by tampering of the meter, regarding which, the prosecution was lodged. The allegations against the petitioner Gulabdeen are that he being an electrician was instrumental in tampering with the meter at the behest of the consumers and on the basis of the statements of the consumers, his name has cropped up in the FIR.

Mr. T.N. Attarwala, learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 04 months and that there is no evidence to connect him with the commission of the offence and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future.

Mr. Baljinder Virk, DAG, Haryana learned State counsel has strongly opposed the grant of bail on the grounds that multiple cases have been got registered for such illegal acts of the petitioner, which has caused huge financial loss to the State and which disentitles him to any relief.

Going through the submissions of the two sides, the petitioner is behind the bars for more than 04 months and the only semblance of evidence is statement of the consumers and legality and validity of which evidence is subject to the trial and, thus, in the light of the same, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail to the satisfaction of Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

However, it is made clear that anything observed

herein shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

Disposed off.

June 08, 2020
amit rana

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No