

203B

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

CRM-M No.22220 of 2020 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 03.09.2020

Angrej Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. Ajaypal Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab

..

ALKA SARIN, J.: (Oral)

Heard through video conferencing.

This is a petition 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 Section 379-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 411, 201, 409, 120-B IPC added later on registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been implicated and arrested on the basis of disclosure statement that the accused persons were hiding in the house of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that a false recovery has been planted on the petitioner.

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.5,31,670/-, a bag used in the robbery, one motorcycle and one toy pistol were 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.2 lakhs 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