

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

239

CRM-M-47985-2021

Date of decision: 23.11.2021

Gursharandeep Singh @ Deep Sekhon

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

This is the first petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.88 dated 02.07.2021 lodged under Sections 363 and 366-A IPC (Section 120-B IPC and Section 192 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 added lateron) registered at Police Station Sadar Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel submits that the delay of 04 days in the FIR in question lends credence to an exaggerated version having been brought-forth against the petitioner in the alleged crime. Learned counsel further submits that the only role attributed to the petitioner by the complainant is that he had come to know that his daughter aged 17 years had been kidnapped by the main accused Nimma Singh with the help of the petitioner. Further submits that the petitioner was in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and named in the FIR only because he was a friend of main accused Nimma Singh who allegedly enticed away the victim. It has also been submitted that similarly situated co-accused Ravi Kumar @ Raju and Rajji @ Rajpreet Singh have since been extended the concession of regular bail vide orders

dated 01.11.2021 and 17.11.2021 respectively. It has been, thus, prayed that the petitioner may be extended the concession of bail, as he has been in custody since 19.08.2021 and there is no likelihood of the trial concluding anytime in the near future, as only challan stands presented so far.

Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer of counsel for the petitioner, has not been able to controvert the factual aspect of the submissions so made by learned counsel for the petitioner with respect to the alleged role of the petitioner in the crime in question.

Heard.

In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties coupled with the fact that similarly situated co-accused have already been extended the concession of bail, I deem it a fit case for grant of the concession of bail to the petitioner, as the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future. The petition as such is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.11.2021

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No