

CRM-M-13086-2020

Date of decision: 09.06.2020

Gurinder Singh @ Vicky

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH**Present:** Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Sandeep Vermani, Addl.A.G., Punjab
for the respondent-State.**FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.(ORAL)**

Petitioner/accused-Gurinder Singh @ Vicky, in this case bearing FIR No.57 dated 14.03.2020 under Sections 307, 353, 186, 427, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25, 27, 54 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station City-II, Mansa, District Mansa, has sought regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C.

The present case was got registered on the statement of SI Hardiyal Singh Dass, alleging that he along with other police officials, received a telephonic call regarding a firing having taken place at Zila Parishad office. When the police party reached the premises of the Zila Parishad, around 3:45 PM on 13.03.2020, a Bolero vehicle bearing No. PB 31 7777 passed by the police vehicle

in which, there were certain persons and followed by another vehicle make Ertiga car, in which a young boy wearing a turban along with two young men were sitting and when the police tried to stop the vehicle, it is alleged that the occupants fired at the police and managed to flee.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since a long time and neither he has been identified nor any specific role is attributed to him. It is a non-injury case. Similarly placed co-accused-Malkit Singh @ Bhapla has been allowed anticipatory bail by this Court.

The learned State counsel though does not displace the facts but has strongly opposed the grant of bail on the grounds of seriousness of the allegations and thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential.

Keeping in view, what is there before this Court and being a non-injury case, where the petitioner is not named in the FIR, nor any specific role is attributed to him and similarly placed co-accused-Malkit Singh @ Bhapla has been allowed anticipatory bail and on the basis of parity.

Further in light of the same and the fact that the investigations and trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future and this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody in the present case. Culpability, if any, shall be determined at the time of trial. Accordingly, he is

ordered to be released on regular bail to the satisfaction of Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands disposed off accordingly.

09.06.2020

Neha

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

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