

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

Date of Decision: 3rd December, 2021

1. CRM-M-40919-2021

... Petitioner

Jagtar Singh @ Kaali

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-48749-2021

... Petitioner

Ramandeep Kumar

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate and
Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Sr. DAG, Punjab for the respondent-State.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(Oral)

1. Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

2. These petitions under Section 439 Cr.P.C. are filed seeking regular bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 139, dated 8th August, 2021, under Sections 307, 353, 186, 332, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC, 1860 and Section 3 and 4 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 registered at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar, Punjab.

3. The allegations are that the petitioners were part of the mob

which protested outside the police station for not taking action in an FIR under Section 302 IPC. The role attributed to petitioner-Jagtar Singh is that he threw a brick bat and qua Ramandeep there is no specific role except that he was present at the spot.

4. Learned counsels for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in custody since 8th August, 2021, investigation is complete, the injuries sustained by the police officials were declared simple and co-accused was granted bail.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and submits that police station was attacked by the petitioners along with their accomplice who took the law in their own hands.

6. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the facts that investigation is complete, co-accused was granted bail and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time, petitioners are granted bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. The petitions are allowed.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

3rd December, 2021

Parveen Sharma

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No