

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

**228**

**CRM-M-16752-2022 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 28.09.2022**

**GULSHAN SINGH ROMANA**

... Petitioner

Versus

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. KS Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

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

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 12.02.2021, registered under Section 420 IPC, at Police Station Bajkhana, District Faridkot, the first one having been dismissed as withdrawn on 31.01.2022.

Status report by way of an affidavit dated 28.09.2022 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Kotkapura, District Faridkot, filed on behalf of the respondent-State, in the Court, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that he, on the pretext of procuring job, has received a sum of Rs.13,50,000/-; that the petitioner has returned Rs.7,00,000/- to the complainant; that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.05.2021 and that as far as three other cases are concerned, the petitioner stands acquitted in two and one is under trial, in which he is on bail.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that there are three complainants, whom the petitioner had cheated on the pretext of procuring them job and that the petitioner is a habitual offender, inasmuch as, there are three more FIRs registered and/or pending against him. He further submits that prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 20.05.2021. As per the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already returned Rs.7,00,000/- to the complainant. In two other cases, the petitioner stands acquitted and in one, he is on bail. Prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, 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/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

**28.09.2022**

Aman Jain

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**