

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

CRM-M-11602-2021

Date of decision:08.04.2021

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.08 dated 16.06.2020 registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Bathinda Range, District Bathinda, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 8, 9, 13(1)(a) of the P.C. Act, 1988 (as amended by P.C. Act, 2018).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is working as Lab Technician, for issuance of MLR report, he has no role to play. He has falsely been involved in the FIR and that it was only during the investigation, his name had surfaced being Lab Technician, Civil Hospital, Mansa. Even the disability certificate is issued by the team of doctors and petitioner has been made a scapegoat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that challan has already been presented before the trial Court and out of 36 witnesses, only one has been examined thus far. The petitioner has been in custody since 16.06.2020.

Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for regular bail, has not disputed the factum of custody period of the petitioner as well as the presentation of the challan before the trial Court. He, on the instructions from Sandeep Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, Bathinda, has brought to the notice of this Court that the bail petitions i.e. CRM-M-21375-2020 and CRM-M-20771-2020 filed by the co-accused, namely, Anil Kumar and Tejinderpal Sharma, respectively, were dismissed by this Court.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner points out that as far as the first bail applications filed by the co-accused, namely, Anil Kumar and Tejinderpal Sharma are concerned, those bail applications were dismissed by this Court prior to the filing of the challan whereas in the present case, the challan has been presented on 06.10.2020.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 16.06.2020. The trial will take time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

08.04.2021
ishwar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No