

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

226

**CRM-M-22984-2022
Date of Decision:16.08.2022**

Kuldip Singh @ Raju

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Ms. Amarjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Bhalla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is the 1st petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.74 dated 14.03.2022 registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case, the petitioner has been in custody since 14.03.2022 and investigation of the case is complete as the challan has already been presented and there are 14 witnesses, out of whom, none have been examined and even the charges have not been framed and thus, the trial is likely to take time to conclude. It is further submitted that the

petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposed the present petition for regular bail and has submitted that in the present case, the petitioner appeared before the trial Court and submitted surety bonds by stating that he was Baldev Singh son of Gurbachan Singh and even prepared an Adhar Card in the name of Baldev Singh son of Gurbachan Singh and when the Presiding Officer became suspicious, it was unearthed that the name of the present petitioner was Kuldip Singh instead of Baldev Singh son of Gurbachan Singh and thus, the surety bonds were rejected. It has been submitted that as per the investigation, the petitioner had done the same as he was paid a sum of Rs.2000/-.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paperbook.

The petitioner has been in custody since 14.03.2022 and investigation of the case is complete and the challan has already been presented and there are 14 witnesses out of whom, none have been examined and even the charges have not been framed; thus, the trial is likely to take time to conclude and the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, 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 concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate and subject to him not being

required in any other case.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

16.08.2022
geeta

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No