

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

109

**CRM-39472-2021 in CRM-M-41536-2021
Date of Decision: 25.11.2021**

Raj Kanwal

....Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Gopal Singh Sandhu, Advocate for applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate for complainant.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

CRM-39472-2021

This application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for preponing the date of hearing of the main petition, which is already fixed for 21.01.2022.

Notice of application.

At the asking of Court, learned State counsel accepts notice and stated that he has no objection if application is allowed.

In view of the grounds mentioned in the application and no objection by learned State counsel, hearing of the main petition is preponed and is taken on Board today itself.

CRM is allowed.

Main Cases

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C has been moved by petitioner-**Raj Kanwal** for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.155 dated 06.08.2021 under Sections 379, 411 and 420 IPC read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

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 allegedly complainant-Harmesh Kumar was duped of Rs.5,51,000/- by the petitioner on the pretext of making it double. He further urges that there was inordinate delay of twenty (20) days in registration of FIR and that too unexplained one. He further submits that petitioner is languishing in custody since 09.08.2021 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. 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 assisted by learned counsel for complainant 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 09.08.2021; 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-**Raj Kanwal** 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, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, as the case may be.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

25.11.2021

Varinder Prashad

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No