

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212)

CRM-M-14032 of 2020

Date of Decision: 19.06.2020

Parminder Singh @ Tiger

Versus

...Petitioner

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vihavdeep Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of bail, upon FIR no.297, dated 12.10.2017, having been registered at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula, against him, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 392 and 397 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for almost 2 years and 6 months, with not even a single prosecution witness having been examined, though the *challan* was presented on 17.05.2018.

He further submits that a co-accused of the petitioner, Gurdeep Singh @ Mann Singh, has already been admitted to bail by this court (a

coordinate Bench) on the same ground of long custody, vide an order dated 24.10.2019 passed in CRM-M-22360 of 2019.

Mr. Manish Bansal, learned DAG, Haryana, submits that there is yet another FIR registered against the petitioner in Police Station, Rajpura and consequently, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

In rebuttal, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that that case was registered on the allegation that the petitioner along with other co-accused were planning for a dacoity and that he has been admitted to bail in that case.

In view of the above, without making any comment on the merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, simply looking at the period of the custody of the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail during the pendency of the trial.

Consequently, this petition is allowed, with the petitioner directed to be enlarged on bail, upon his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

19.06.2020
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No