

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

**220**

**CRM-M-52307-2019  
Date of decision: 15.01.2020**

Babbu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI**

Present : Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kaundal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)**

The petitioner has filed the present (first) petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.258 dated 14.11.2019 under Sections 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, "the IPC") registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Learned State counsel has appeared and opposed the bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel and gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The petitioner is alleged to have taken money from complainant-ASI Dilbagh Singh and and ASI Roop Singh for arranging disposal of their departmental appeals against disciplinary proceedings taken against them in their favour from Inspector General of Police, Bathinda. No recovery was made from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since

14.11.2019. Trial is likely to take long time. Further detention of the petitioner in custody will not serve any purpose. Therefore, the petitioner may be ordered to be released on regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner cheated ASI Dilbagh Singh and ASI Roop Singh and dishonestly induced them to deliver amount of Rs.50,000/- and also criminally intimidated them and thereby committed offences punishable under Sections 420 and 506 of the IPC and Section 8 of the P.C. Act. The petitioner does not deserve regular bail and the petition may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and evidence against the petitioner, the fact that the question of guilt or innocence of the petitioner has to be decided on the basis of evidence to be produced during trial which is likely to take long time and that no useful purpose will be served by detention of the petitioner in custody but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**15.01.2020**

Kavneet Singh/vinay

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No