

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

223

**CRM-M-19013-2020 (O & M)
Date of Decision: November 03, 2021**

GURLAL SINGH @ LALLI

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr.Sukhpreet Kaur Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.P.S.Ishar, Advocate for the complainant.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.23 dated 07.04.2019, under Sections 302, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Joga, District Mansa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been involved merely on suspicion. The father of the complainant was found dead in the morning on 07.04.2019. It is alleged in the FIR that the father of the complainant was working in a liquor shop and after the body of the father of the complainant was found, he had made inquiries and came to know that petitioner and co-accused Bikramjit Singh had murdered his father. They used to come and demand liquor without making payment and his father used to refuse them liquor on credit. She further contends that it is alleged that an eye witness had informed the police after 04 days that he had seen the petitioner and co-accused murdering the deceased. The presence of eye witness would be doubtful inasmuch as he did not inform the police about the occurrence on the same day. The Forensic team had visited the scene of the crime but no incriminating material against the petitioner has been found. She also contends

that the petitioner is a poor person and a sole breadwinner of his family which comprises his wife and minor children. The father of the petitioner has expired a few months ago. The petitioner is in custody for over 02 years and 07 months.

Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate which indicates that the petitioner is in custody for 02 years, 06 months and 22 days. He states that 10 out of 17 prosecution witnesses have been examined. He while referring to the reply contends that the petitioner is involved in four other cases, out of which he was acquitted in two cases, convicted in one case under the Excise Act and is under-trial in one case.

Learned counsel for the complainant contends that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Heard.

In view of the above, especially when the petitioner is in custody for over 02 years and 06 months, Covid 19 pandemic and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

November 03, 2021
A.Kaundal

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No