

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-10364-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-9.3.2021

Manraj Singh @ Manmohit Singh @ Man ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Rajbir Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.88 dated 29.6.2020 at Police Station Gharinda, Police District Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar under Sections 387, 341 and 411 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25, 27, 28, 54 and 59 of Arms Act.
2. As per the case of prosecution, the FIR was registered on the statement of Jaswinder Singh, wherein he alleged that on 29.6.2020 at about 7:30 P.M. four persons, who were in police uniform, entered his house and stated that since the complainant had caused accident so his vehicle is to be inspected. It is alleged that the said persons, however, upon entering the house forcibly took away an amount of ₹5-6 lakhs, 12-14 tollas of gold ornaments and while leaving also took away a 12 bore double barrel gun alongwith 25

cartridges while leaving the said accused, locked the complainant and others in a room.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is nowhere named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case when he was arrested in some other case and in which the petitioner is alleged to have suffered a disclosure statement regarding his involvement in the instant case.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner himself has confessed his guilt, no case for grant of bail is made out, particularly since he happens to be involved in two other cases. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 8 months and that charges are yet to be framed in the instant case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the fact that it is a case where the petitioner is not named in the FIR and had been nominated subsequently on the basis of an alleged disclosure statement made by the petitioner himself and while noticing that the petitioner has already been behind bars since the last about 8 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. 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.

9.3.2021

pankaj

Whether speaking /reasoned

Whether Reportable

Yes / No

Yes / No

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge