

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42980-2022
DECIDED ON: 09.11.2022

SATPAL

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Munish Kamboj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition seeking regular bail in FIR No.345, dated 22.10.2020, under Sections 406, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 of the IPC (Sections 120-B, 201 of the IPC added) and (Section 132 of the GST Act Deleted later on), registered at Police Station Civil Line Sirsa, District Sirsa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and even as per the version of the FIR, alleged offence was committed by the firm M/s SP Enterprises, which was opened in the name of the petitioner, however, it is brought to the notice of this Court that neither the firm was opened by the petitioner nor was it operated by the petitioner. He also contends that it is the co-accused Suresh @ John, who has committed the alleged offence. He further submits that the petitioner is an illiterate person and does the work of labour and

because of the innocence of the petitioner, co-accused Suresh @ John trapped him in the present case by opening a firm in the name of the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record. According to the custody certificate, the petitioner is already behind bars for the last 1 year, 1 month and 15 days and no other case is pending against the petitioner.

Looking at the totality of the facts and circumstances and in view of the fact that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take long time and the petitioner is behind bars for the last 1 year, 1 month and 15 days, therefore, no fruitful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars, therefore, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The present petition is, therefore, allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

09.11.2022

poonam negi

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>