

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

CRM-M-21644-2020

Date of decision: **13.08.2020**

SAJAN @ SUNNY

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Fatehjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, AAG, Punjab.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video
conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual
Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner-Sajan @ Sunny has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.195 dated 31.10.2017 at Police Station Division No.3, Jalandhar under Sections 392 & 395 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Montu Gill, wherein it has been alleged that he is running a 'Fitness and Health Club' in Jalandhar and that on 14.10.2017 he went upto Anil Kumar to collect the amount due from him. While he was talking to aforesaid Anil Kumar, 6-7 persons, out of whom two were wearing turbans, came there. It is alleged that one of them took out a pistol and pointed the same at the complainant, while the remaining were carrying 'Kirpans' and 'Datar'. One of the said persons

took an amount of ₹57,000/- from the pocket of the pants worn by the complainant and thereafter while issuing threats the said persons went towards railway road from the market side. It is further stated therein that the complainant had been trying to search for the said persons and later came to know their names as Bikramjeet Singh, Sher Singh @ Babbar, Mukal, Kishan, Sunny and Heera. It is further stated therein that he shall produce the CCTV footage wherein they are seen running through the market.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that although the prosecution initially claimed that there was some CCTV footage showing the accused but in fact the said CCTV footage was found to be blank. It has further been submitted that 2 of the co-accused namely Krishan Lal and Mukul Brar have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 14.1.2020 & 15.6.2020 and that in these circumstances the petitioner also deserves the same concession on the ground of parity.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submits that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and he is also involved in 3 other cases including one under Section 307 IPC, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars since last about 1 year and 4 months and while noticing that 2 co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted concession of bail, further detention

of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume some time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

13.08.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**