

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

CRM-M-52746-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.07.2022

Pritam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Abhijeet Partap Singh Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Nikhil Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 196 dated 04.08.2021, registered under Sections 420, 408, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Division No. 6, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations against the petitioner are that an amount of Rs. 2 lakh was deposited in his account as salary by showing him as an employee of the Company by his son working with the Company as Security Supervisor, but the petitioner has never worked with the Company; that the account was opened by his son at the instance of the Company; that the fact of deposit and withdrawal of the amount was not in his knowledge, the petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged transactions of deposit/withdrawal; that the petitioner has been in

custody since 05.08.2021 and that Narinder Kaur @ Maninder Kaur, has already been granted regular bail by a Coordinate Bench vide order dated 02.12.2021.

He further points out that as per the details of the accounts filed by the learned State counsel, some transactions of deposit/withdrawal were made from the same place in Ludhiana City, whereas the petitioner is residing in village Bachhowal, Tehsil Phillaur, District Jalandhar and moreover, the petitioner is a 66 years aged and illiterate person.

Learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the amount of salary of the employees of the Company was transferred in the account of the petitioner by his son and the petitioner is one of the beneficiaries. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner and the fact co-accused Narinder Kaur @ Maninder Kaur, wife of the petitioner is on regular bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.08.2021. The petitioner was not an employee of the Company. Co-accused Narinder Kaur @ Maninder Kaur, wife of the petitioner, has already been granted regular bail by a Coordinate Bench vide order dated 02.12.2021. The petitioner is an aged person. The conclusion of the trial would take 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.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

27.07.2022
Mangal Singh

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