

212

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

CRM-M-6880-2022

Date of Decision: 23.02.2022

Gurpinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Tejinder S.Hundal, Advocate,
for respondent No.2/complainant.
(Through Video Conference)

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.105, dated 23.12.2021, under Sections 420/467/468/471 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda, Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that though the allegations alleged against the petitioner in the present FIR are yet to be proved but the parties have already settled their dispute vide Panchayat Compromise dated 08.02.2022 (Annexure P-3) and on the basis of it, even a petition for quashing of the present FIR has also been filed, wherein notice of motion has been issued by this Court. Learned counsel further submits that keeping in view the said fact, as there is no apprehension with regard to petitioner influencing the trial or any witnesses, he may kindly be extended the concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel concedes the fact that on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties, CRM-M-7272-2022 has already been filed, wherein notice of motion has been issued.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant, who has also joined the proceedings through video conference, raises no objection in case prayer of the petitioner for grant of regular bail is accepted.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

In the present case, the dispute between the parties is of taking money by the accused on the pretext of sending daughter of the petitioner to Canada, keeping in view that the investigation into the allegations is already over and the challan has also been submitted by the Investigating Agency, coupled with the fact that the parties have already compromised their dispute, and a quashing petition has also been filed before this Court to quash the FIR in question, wherein notice of motion has been issued, no useful purpose will be achieved in keeping the petitioner behind the bars any further during the conduct of the trial as there is no apprehension of the petitioner influencing the trial or any witnesses in the facts and circumstances of the present case as the trial is likely to take some time before it concludes in view of the restrictive working of the Courts due to Covid-19 pandemic.

In view of the above and without commenting upon the merits of the case, it is directed that the petitioner be released on regular bail, subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

23.02.2022

Apurva

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable : | No |