

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

220

**CRM-M-32909-2022
Date of decision: 03.08.2022**

JOBANDEEP SINGH @ JOBANJEET SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present : Mr. Gursimran Singh Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ. J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.06 dated 10.01.2022 under Sections 379-B(2)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (later on offence under Section 201, 411, 120-B of the IPC have been added) registered at Police Station Sadar Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. Briefly, the case of the prosecution as per the FIR registered on the statement of Ranjit Singh son of Bachan Singh is to the effect that he has retired from Railway Department as Gangman and he along with his son Maninder Singh is running a Verka Milk agency. They supplied milk of the Verka Plant and collected cash everyday and deposit the same at the HDFC Bank Batala Road, Amritsar. As per the

routine an amount of Rs.5 lakhs collected in cash against the milk supplied was to be in a black colour bag and the same was kept in the dicky of the Activa bearing registration No.PB-02-CU-3501. At about 2 pm when the complainant had reached at the HDFC Bank and had took out the bag, three men riding a motorcycle and with muffled faces snatched the bag. During the scuffle, the mask of one of them was uncovered whom the complainant could identify. The complainant was pushed as a result whereof he fell down and received certain injuries.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contend that it is a case of blind FIR where no person was identified by the complainant. Subsequently, the petitioner were arrested and have been in judicial custody since 19.01.2022. The petitioner is stated to be young persons aged 31 years having no criminal antecedents. It is further contended that the petitioner is in custody since his arrest and that the investigation in the case is complete. He further contends that similarly placed co-accused have already granted concession of regular bail in CRM-M-15338-2022 titled “Gurinder Singh versus State of Punjab” along with CRM-M-15579-2022 titled “Varinder Singh versus State of Punjab” and CRM-M-22323-2022 titled Kwarbir Singh versus State of Punjab”. He submits that the allegations against the petitioner are at par with the said co-accused.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has submitted that the recovery has already been effected from the petitioner, which shows their involvement in the commission of the offence. She further could not controvert the fact that the petitioner are not accused in any other case and that they have already undergone an actual custody of 06

months and 14 days. Furthermore, the investigation in the case is already concluded and that no prosecution evidence has been recorded so far. She further could not controvert the fact that case of the petitioner would be at par with the co-accused to whom concession of bail has been extended by this Court vide order dated 13.07.2022.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material on record.

6. Taking into consideration the age of the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the stage of trial as well as the period of custody undergone by the petitioner along with fact that similarly placed co-accused have already granted concession of regular bail, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the present petitions is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

AUGUST 03, 2022
vishal sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No