

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

226

CRM-M-32276-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.05.2022

PARVEEN MALHOTRA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Ms. Bhavna Kapur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.295 dated 08.11.2018, registered under Sections 408, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 201, 120-B IPC at Police Station Division No.6, Jalandhar.

Status report by way of an affidavit dated 06.12.2021 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, (Model Town), Jalandhar, filed on behalf of the respondent-State, in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner was working as an employee of Harinder Group of Companies from 16.02.2012 till 03.05.2017; that the petitioner never collected any money for his own use and the money collected, whatsoever, was at the behest of the Company and that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.04.2021. She further submits that all the relevant documents have already been taken into possession by the investigating agency and that

the challan has also been presented.

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 the petitioner along with the co-accused had admitted their guilty in the year 2017. He further submits that only two prosecution witnesses have been examined, so far.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 03.04.2021. Nothing further is to be recovered from the petitioner. Most of the 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 both the sides, 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.

12.05.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*