

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

CRM-M-48893-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.02.2022

Harnarinder Singh @ Honey

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Tarundeep Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, DAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.102 dated 27.08.2016, registered at Police Station Hathur, Ludhiana, under Sections 302, 307, 324, 148 and 149 IPC and Section 326 IPC (added later on) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Status report by way of affidavit dated 29.01.2022 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Raikot, District Ludhiana, already filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case, as no offence has been committed by him; and that during inquiry, the petitioner was declared innocent by SIT and on 18.01.2020, the petitioner was summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana,

along with co-accused Amandeep Singh @ Buta, Jagraj Singh @ Raju and Inderjit Singh @ Gori, as an additional accused to face the trial and that out of them two co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail with a direction to join the investigation. The petitioner has actually undergone the sentence of more than 4 months. In another case, the petitioner is on bail

Learned State counsel, vehemently opposes the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute the fact that earlier the petitioner was declared innocent during inquiry conducted by the SIT and later on summoned by the Court under Section 319 Cr.P.C. along with three other co-accused.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has actually undergone the sentence of more than 4 months. Two accused summoned with the petitioner by the Court under Section 319 Cr.P.C. have already been granted anticipatory bail. The conclusion of the trial would take a long time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

08.02.2022

Mangal Singh

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No