

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

205

CRM-M-21473 of 2020

Date of decision : 04.09.2020.

Dharaminder Singh @ Gugni

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.193 dated 17.12.2016, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, Section 25 of the Arms Act and Sections 17/18/19/20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, registered at Police Station Baghapurana, district Moga.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and has been arraigned as an accused on the statement of co-accused, namely, Ramandeep Singh. He further contends that nothing has been recovered from the petitioner and at the time of recording the aforementioned statement of the co-accused, the petitioner was in custody in another case and therefore, it is possible that he has been falsely implicated. He also contends that the petitioner is in custody for over 2 ½ years.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Raghwinder Singh, contends that there are serious allegations against the petitioner as co-accused, namely, Ramandeep Singh had disclosed that the petitioner through his manager had arranged weapons for killing various leaders. He

further contends that the petitioner is involved in six other cases and has been convicted in one wherein he has to undergo life imprisonment. He also contends that 12 out of 74 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

Heard through video conferencing.

In view of the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused on the statement of co-accused; no overt act has been attributed to him; no recovery is effected from the petitioner; he is in custody for over 2 ½ years; the COVID-19 pandemic, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

September 04, 2020

sonia gugnani

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