

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

**CRM-M No.3500 of 2021
Date of Decision : 19.02.2021**

Ranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present : Mr. Gopal S. Nahel, Advocate
for the Petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab
for the Respondent/State.

Mr. Vivek Gupta, Advocate
for the Complainant.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

The instant Petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking Regular Bail on behalf of the Petitioner in case FIR No.172, dated 23.06.2020, registered under Sections 420 of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur.

2. Custody Certificate has not been sent up. But Ld. Counsel for the State submits that the Petitioner was arrest in the case on 17th December, 2020 and after completion of investigation Challan against him has been submitted on the 15th February this year under sections 420, 406 and 34 of the IPC.

3. His prayer for bail is nevertheless opposed on behalf of the

Complainant, whose Ld. Counsel has sent up a copy of the order passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in CRM-M No.18470 of 2020 vide which the Petitioner's prayer for Anticipatory Bail was dismissed on the 14th October, 2020.

4. In the aforesaid order, note was also taken of the fact that the Petitioner is involved in another case being FIR No.143 dated 18th November, 2016 and is a convict in FIR No.80 dated 16th May, 2007 in which Life Imprisonment has been awarded to him in respect of offences under Sections 302, 307 and 34 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

5. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner however submits that such sentence awarded to his Client has been suspended by this Court on 8th August, 2012, vide CRM No.30405 of 2012 in CRA-S-D-1141-DB of 2011.

6. It has been held by the Supreme Court in '**Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of U.P. and another, 2020(1) R.C.R. (Criminal) 831** and also '**Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and another', 2012 AIR (SC) (Cri) 469**, that pendency of several criminal cases against the accused cannot itself be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail.

7. Investigation against the Petitioner has already been completed. His further detention for an indefinite period in the present case at this stage is, therefore, not called for, since the trial is likely to take its own substantial time.

8. Consequently, the Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail

subject to imposition of appropriate stringent conditions which are left to the discretion of the Ld. Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. Disposed off.

February 19, 2021
Dpr

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

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