

213-A

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

CRM-M-37949-2020 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 25.11.2020

Harinder Singh

.... Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, SR. DAG, Punjab.

ALKA SARIN, J (Oral)

Heard through Video Conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 CrPC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.127 dated 27.06.2019 registered under Sections 307, 353, 332, 186, 224, 436, 427, 148, 149 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 52-A of Prison Act, 1874 at Police Station Division No.7, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that though the petitioner has been named in the FIR, however, totally vague and general allegations have been made and no specific role has been attributed to him. The petitioner has been in custody since 04.02.2020. It is further contended that no useful purpose would be served by his further detention in custody.

Learned counsel has further relied upon the orders passed by this Court in the cases of the co-accused granting regular bail i.e. **CRM-M No.14153 of 2020** titled as **"Gagandeep @ Gagandeep Singh V/s State of Punjab"** decided on 30.06.2020; **CRM-M No.18018 of 2020**

M No.15084 of 2020 titled as “Gurjant Singh V/s State of Punjab” decided on 29.06.2020; CRM-M No.26979 of 2020 titled as “Karan Chaudhary @ Karam Chaudhary V/s State of Punjab” decided on 16.09.2020; CRM-M No.46775 of 2019 titled as “Karamjit Singh @ Kalu V/s State of Punjab” decided on 08.01.2020; CRM-M No.13216 of 2020 titled as “Jota Ram @ Joti Vs. The State of Punjab” decided on 17.11.2020; CRM-M No.22861-2020 titled as “Harmanjit Singh @ Marbel Vs. State of Punjab” decided on 17.11.2020 and CRM-M No.32813 of 2020 titled as “Ranjit Singh Vs. State of Punjab decided on 17.11.2020.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that even on the ground of parity the petitioner would be entitled to bail.

The petition has been opposed by the learned counsel for the State on the ground that serious allegations have been made against the petitioner. Learned State counsel, however, is not in a position to deny that similarly situated co-accused have been granted bail by this Court.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and considering that the nature of allegations against the petitioner are general and vague and no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and that the similarly situated co-accused have been granted regular bail by this Court and that the trial is likely to take some time especially in view the situation created due to the pandemic COVID-19, I deem this to be a fit case for grant regular bail to the petitioner. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Disposed off.

However, the prosecution will always be at liberty to get the bail cancelled, in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the concession of bail in any manner.

November 25, 2020
tripti

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

Whether reportable	Yes/ No.
Whether speaking	Yes/No