

CRM-M-11059-2021

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

CRM-M-11059-2021

Date of decision: 18.05.2022

Mahant Parshant Puri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Ishita Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.151 dated 20.03.2020, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Karnal, District Karnal, under Sections 420, 406, 328, 506 and 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged occurrence took place on 05.10.2019 whereas the above-noted FIR was registered on 20.03.2020 i.e. after a delay of about 05 months; that allegations against the petitioner are that by hatching a conspiracy, he had introduced Satish, father of the complainant, to Naresh alias Rajesh and doctor, who had sold the fake gold brick to Satish. It is further contended that the petitioner is not the kingpin.

Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.03.2020; that out of 36 prosecution witnesses, none has

CRM-M-11059-2021

been examined so far. On this premise, learned counsel prays that the petitioner be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer for the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR and that it was the petitioner, who had introduced Satish to Naresh alias Rajesh and doctor. It is also submitted that in the presence of the petitioner, the brick purported to be made of gold, was exchanged for Rs.86 lakh and out of the same, an amount of Rs.13,000/- had been recovered from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 22.03.2020. The challan has already been presented. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Trial is unlikely to conclude any time soon. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

18.05.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No