

206

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

CRM-M-41095-2020

Date of decision-26.03.2021

Veerpal Singh @ Bitto

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. H.S.Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harsimar Singh Sitta, AAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No.114 dated 05.10.2020 registered under Section 379-B Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 IPC added later on) at Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 06.10.2020.

The FIR was registered on the statement of Gurpreet Kaur wife of Swaran Singh, wherein it was alleged that she was doing stitching course in G.M Palace. On 03.10.2020, at about 12.30 p.m., after completion of her class, when she was going towards village Ghaloti, two persons came on motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-29-AB-8938 and forcibly snatched an envelope from her hand, which

was containing Rs.520/- cash and mobile phone. She tried to get back her things, but failed. On seeing the persons gathering at the spot, accused persons ran away. She alleged that she was searching the accused persons alongwith her husband and came to know that Palvinder Singh and Veerpal Singh @ Bittu (petitioner) committed offence. On these broad allegations, the FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is delay of two days in filing the FIR as occurrence took place on 03.10.2020, whereas FIR was registered on 05.10.2020. He submits that the investigation of the case is complete. According to him, after framing of charges on 10.02.2021, no prosecution witness has been examined so far. He submits that the trial is likely to consume some time, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be justified. He prays for bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Sukhwinder Singh opposed the prayer on the ground that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. However, it is not disputed by him that the investigation of the case is complete and after framing of charges on 10.02.2021, no prosecution witness has been examined.

Considering the above background and the fact that the trial will take considerable time to conclude, this Court finds that further detention may not be necessary for any useful purpose, who is confined in judicial custody since his arrest on 06.10.2020.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

26.03.2021

vanita

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