

103+214

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

**CRM No.8665 of 2022 in/and
CRM-M No.7522 of 2022
Date of Decision: 11.03.2022**

Amarjit Singh

.....Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Gurminder S. Salana, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the Respondent/State.

(Heard through video conferencing)

PANKAJ JAIN J. (ORAL)

CRM No.8665 of 2022

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the applicant/
petitioner is permitted to place on record the supplementary statements of
the complainant marked as Annexures P-3 and P-4.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

Application stands disposed off.

CRM-M No.7522 of 2022

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for
grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.133, dated 29th

October, 2021, registered under Sections 363, 366 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 120-B of the IPC added subsequently), at Police Station Khamanon, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Admittedly, the petitioner was not named in FIR at the first instance but was named only in the supplementary statement suffered on 10th December, 2021 by the complainant, who happens to be the father of the victim.

3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that no role has been attributed to the petitioner and no offence is, thus, made out against him.

4. Ld. State Counsel submits that as per the allegations in supplementary statement suffered by the informant, it is the petitioner, who in fact brought the girl from her house after which she eloped with Janak Singh, the main accused. He further submits that investigation, in the case, is complete and the Challan already stands presented *qua* the petitioner.

5. Had it been the case where the girl had come with the petitioner from her house, the informant who happens to be her father would have named the petitioner at the first instance.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner is held to be entitled for concession of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. Nothing observed herein shall be construed to be an expression

of an opinion on the merits of the case.

March 11, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No