

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

CRM-M No.14616 of 2020 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: 03.09.2020

Deanial

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab

..

ALKA SARIN, J.:

Heard through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.08, dated 17.02.2020 under Sections 379-B, 411, 201, 120B, 409 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case as neither he was named in the FIR nor any person has identified the petitioner at the spot. It has further been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the FIR was registered against unidentified persons and the petitioner was later implicated during the course of investigation. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further relied upon the orders dated 13.07.2020 passed in the case of the co-accused granting him bail in CRM-M No.16581 of 2020 titled: *Satnam Singh vs. State of Punjab* and CRM-M No.14471 of 2020 titled: *Sagar vs. State of Punjab*, decided on 16.06.2020.

Learned State counsel has informed the Court that though the challan has been presented the charges are yet to be framed in the present case. It has further been contended by the learned counsel for the State that an amount of Rs.1,76,000/- and a pair of gold tops was recovered from the petitioner.

Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the above and considering the existing situation due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that the trial is likely to take some time, this Court deems it appropriate to grant regular bail to the petitioner subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds in the sum of Rs.1 lakh to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

It is, however, made clear that nothing observed herein would be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The prosecution would always be at liberty to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the same in any manner.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

03.09.2020

parkash

NOTE:

Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking

Whether reportable: YES/NO