

211/3

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

CRM-M No.35213 of 2019

Date of Decision: 27.01.2020

YOGRAJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sultan Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Senior DAG Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.14 dated 10.06.2018, registered under Sections 420/364-A/382/386/387/212/216/216-A/120-B IPC 1860, Section 42, 52-A of Prisoners Act 1894, Sections 10, 11 and 13 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act 1967 (However Section 25 of Arms Act 1959 added later on) at Police Station SSOC Amritsar (However in the impugned order dated 30.07.2019 some of the Sections not written/wrongly written i.e. FIR No.14 dated 10.06.2018 under Sections 420, 382, 364, 386, 387, 212, 216-A, 120-B of Indian Penal Code 1860, Section 42, 52-A of Prisoners Act 1894, Section 10, 11 & 13 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act 1967 and Section 25 of Arms Act 1959 at P.S. SSOC, Amritsar.

As per allegations and charges against the petitioner,

petitioner Nand Kishore, Yograj Singh and Pargat Singh in

pursuance of criminal conspiracy with each other cheated Tarsem Masih, Robin, Gurjant Singh by using sims which were issued in their names, but the accused were using the sims without their knowledge.

The aforesaid sims are claimed to be valuable security and offence of cheating has been alleged against the accused as well.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Gurmail Singh states that no sim has been recovered from any of the accused. Co-accused Taranjot Singh @ Tanna has already been granted bail by this Court in CRM M No.4544 of 2019 vide order dated 01.03.2019. The trial of the case may take some time in its conclusion.

In view of above, without meaning anything on merits of the case, petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove, would be construed to be an opinion on merits of the case.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

27.01.2020

sangeeta

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No