

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARAYANA AT CHANDIGARH
203 (PROCEEDINGS THROUGH V.C.)

CRM-M-19979-2020
Date of decision: 05.10.2020

PARAMVIR SINGH @ RINKA

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

..RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Singh Manku, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S.Deol, DAG, Punjab,
for the State.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this application is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 65 dated 05.08.2019 under Section 379-B, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Nurmahal, District Jalandhar.

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of he statement of the co-accused. It is contended that the petitioner is in custody since 21.09.2019. Although there are total 22 cases registered against the petitioner, out of which, in 9 of cases, he is on bail, in 7 cases, he has already been convicted and has already undergone sentence and in 5 cases, he has been acquitted. He, therefore, contends that this case is based upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused, therefore, the petitioner deserves

the concession of bail as he is similarly placed as Sandeep Singh @ Rimpa, the co-accused, who has been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 22.09.2020 in CRM-M-28112 of 2020. Counsel further contends that out of 18 witnesses, only 5 witnesses have been examined and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future and, therefore, the continuation of the petitioner in custody would not serve any purpose.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State asserts that the petitioner is a habitual offender which fact is apparent from the fact that there are large number of cases registered against him and in 7 cases, he has already undergone the sentence after he was found guilty. He, therefore, contends that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. The other factual aspects, as have been pointed out by the counsel for the petitioner, could not be disputed by the counsel for the State.

I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and with their assistance, have gone through the records of the case.

The case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused Sandeep Singh @ Rimpa, who has been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 22.09.2020, referred to above, rather he is on a better footing as there are 22 cases registered against him whereas in the case of Sandeep Singh @ Rimpa, there are 36 cases registered against him. The trial is not likely to conclude in near future as only 5 witnesses have been examined out of total 18 witnesses and because of the prevailing pandemic, the trial is not likely to conclude in near future, therefore, keeping the petitioner in custody would serve no purpose.

In view of the above, the present application deserves to be

allowed.

Ordered accordingly.

Petitioner is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Jalandhar.

Any observation made herein above shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial in any manner.

October 05 2020

pj

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No