

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

(I) CRM-M-23244-2020 (O&M)

Paramjit Singh @ Noni ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(II) CRM-M-25839-2020 (O&M)

Tarsem Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Date of Decision: 23.03.2021

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner/s.

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

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

CRM-9103-2021

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the statements of PW-1 to PW-4 are taken on record
as Annexures P-6 to P-9, subject to all just exceptions.

**CRM-M-23244-2020 &
CRM-M-25839-2020**

1. This order shall dispose off the aforesaid two petitions i.e. CRM-M-23244-2020 filed on behalf of Paramjit Singh @ Noni and

CRM-M-25839-2020 filed on behalf of Tarsem Singh seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against them vide FIR No.29 dated 24.02.2020 at Police Station 'Cantonment' District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Bholi wife of Gurmej Singh (deceased), wherein it is alleged that on 23.02.2020, her husband died and that she had now come to know that her husband had gone to the house of Tarsem Singh @ Soma and that Bobby, Prince, Sabbu and Mandeep Singh gave beatings on account of which he had died. It is further alleged that Tarsem Singh, Prince, Bobby, Sabbu and Noni after killing had thrown the dead body of her husband at her house.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that a false FIR has been lodged at the instance of the complainant and that in fact it is a case of blind murder. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that during the course of trial, statements of the complainant and of all other eye-witnesses have been recorded and that all of them have turned hostile and have not supported the case of the complainant. Learned counsel, in this regard, has drawn the attention of this Court to the statements of PW-1 to PW-4, which have been placed on record today as Annexures P-6 to P-9.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that the complainant and other PWs had not supported the case of the prosecution at all. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioners in any case have been behind bars since the last about 1 year.

5. Having regard to the fact that the complainant and other PWs have not supported the case of the prosecution, when examined during the proceedings of trial and also while noticing that the petitioners have been behind bars since the last about 1 year, further detention of the petitioners will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial will take some time. Both the petitions, as such, are accepted and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

23.03.2021

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGEWhether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**