

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

205

CRM-M-2452-2021(O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.04.2021

Ranjit Singh @ Hira ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. M.S. Bajwa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amar Ashok Pathak, Addl. AG, Punjab.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.180 dated 02.11.2020 under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 120-B of IPC added later) at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran, Punjab.
2. The FIR in question was lodged pursuant to statement of Balwinder Singh son of Jarnail Singh, wherein it is alleged that on 02.11.2020 when he along with his father Jarnail Singh was going on a motorcycle after withdrawing an amount of Rs.5.50 lakhs from the State Bank of India, Bhikhiwind, then three young boys followed them on a motorcycle and waylaid them. It is alleged that the said boys were carrying 'datars' and gave a blow with a 'datar' hitting the head light of motorcycle and on account of

which he as well as his father fell down. It is further alleged that the said boys also inflicted a blow with '*datar*' on the left thigh of complainant's father and snatched the bag containing the amount of Rs.5.50 lakhs. It is the case of the prosecution that the matter was enquired into and investigated by the police during the course of which it was found that the entire drama of snatching of Rs.5.50 lakhs from the complainant and his father was stage-managed in an attempt to avoid the payment of the lease amount to Harjit Singh from whom the complainant and his father had taken land on lease. It is further the case of prosecution that Balwinder Singh @ Gill son of Lakhwinder Singh, Ranjit Singh and Gurdit Singh had connived with the complainant Balwinder Singh and his father Jarnail Singh for stage-managing the alleged robbery.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case since the challan already stands presented, his detention will not serve any useful purpose.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner had connived with the main accused in enacting the drama of alleged robbery, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 6 months and that he is not involved in any other case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the aforestated position, wherein the petitioner has been behind bars for the substantial period of about 6 months

and challan already stands presented and the petitioner is not even stated to be involved in any other case, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial will take 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.

28.04.2021

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**