

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-4344-2020 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-23.9.2022

Bharat Rathore ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Anmol Partap Singh Mann, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, DAG, Punjab,  
assisted by ASI Major Singh.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.** (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.251, dated 26.11.2019, Police Station Khanna, District Ludhiana, under Sectionss 420 and 406 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Gupreet Singh @ Vicky, wherein it is alleged that he met Amrik Singh, who held out a representation that he along with his other companions are running a scheme and they could double the money, which is given to them and that they are having some devices/chemical for doing the same. It is further alleged in the FIR that Amrik Singh introduced the complainant to four persons namely Paramjit

Singh Sandhu @ Pamma, Bharat Rathore (petitioner), Swaran Singh and Lakhwinder Singh @ Bindi and who gave a demonstration to him of making a counterfeit currency notes of Rs.500/-. The complainant being taken in by the aforesaid demonstration gave an amount of Rs.2.5 lakhs to the accused. It is further alleged that subsequently, he gave another amount of Rs.6.5 lakhs to the accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present and that there are general allegations against all the accused and the story put-forth by the complainant that he was actually given a demonstration of doubling the amount cannot be believed since the complainant is a matured person and could not have been deceived in this manner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that, in the present case, challan already stands presented and charges have been framed and since the petitioner has already been behind bar for a substantial period of more than 5 months, he deserves the concession of bail.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and that there are serious allegations against him, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has further informed that the petitioner after having been released on *interim* bail due to COVID-19, pursuant to general orders passed by a High Powered Committee, did not surrender back on time and it was only when a direction was given to him by this Court that he chose to surrender. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 5 months and 10 days and as on date, none out of the cited 18 PWs has been examined and infact the presence of some of the co-

accused is yet to be secured. It has also been informed that the petitioner otherwise is not involved in any other case.

5. This Court has considered rival submissions.
6. It is no doubt correct that serious allegations are levelled against the petitioner. However, from the facts as have been brought to the notice of this Court, it is apparent that conclusion of trial is likely to consume time inasmuch as the presence of some of the co-accused is yet to be secured. The petitioner has already been behind bars for a substantial period of 5 months and 10 days and none out of the cited 18 PWs has been examined so far. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.
7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**23.9.2022**

pankaj

**( Gurvinder Singh Gill )  
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No