

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

**116 +266**

**CRM-32002-2021 in/and  
CRM-M-23929-2021  
Date of Decision: 08.11.2021**

Tejinder Pal Singh

....Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

----

**Present:** Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)**

**CRM-32002-2021**

This application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been moved by applicant/petitioner seeking preponement of hearing of main petition from 12.10.2021 to an earlier date.

Since the date 12.10.2021 fixed in the main case has already passed, instant application for preponement of hearing of the main petition has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

**Main Case**

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C has been moved by petitioner-**Tejinder Pal Singh** for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.274 dated 07.09.2019 under Sections 120-B, 201, 379-B, 392, 397, 412 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kunjpura,

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that version, as alleged in the FIR, is totally concocted one and there is no iota of truth therein. He further submits that neither name of petitioner figured in the FIR as accused nor any of his description has been given in the FIR. He further urges that alleged attributed role of petitioner is that he had given input to the co-accused that complainant party is quite affluent. He further urges that there is no active participation of petitioner in the commission of alleged offence. He further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 20.01.2021 and he is no more required by the Police for any investigation purpose as after completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court on 04.03.2021 and trial has commenced. He further urges that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and he may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing instant petition has vehemently argued that keeping in view seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the contents of petition.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is in custody since 20.01.2021; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation

purpose; that *Challan* has already been presented in Court and since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, he deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner-**Tejinder Pal Singh** is allowed and he is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Karnal, as the case may be.

**(LALIT BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**08.11.2021**

*Varinder Prashad*

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No