

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-59341-2022
Decided on :23.12.2022

Ravi Tandon

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Rajnikant Upadhyay, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 57 dated 01.09.2022 registered under Sections 409, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sector-19, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2022 and investigation is complete and challan has been presented and there are 7 prosecution witnesses, out of which, none have been examined as yet and thus, the conclusion of trial is likely to take time. It is further submitted that the recovery in the present case has already been effected and thus, no purpose would be served by keeping the present petitioner in further incarceration.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the present petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner and has

submitted that the car in question have been recovered from the co-accused but the keys of the car have been recovered from the present petitioner and thus, the involvement of the present petitioner, prima facie, is proved.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper book.

Keeping in view abovesaid facts and circumstances more so, the facts that the petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2022 and investigation is complete and challan has been presented and there are 7 prosecution witnesses, out of which, none have been examined as yet and thus, the conclusion of trial is likely to take time, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to his not being required in any other case.

However, it is made clear that in case, any act is done by the petitioner to threaten the complainant or any of the witnesses, then it would be open to the State to move an application for cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

23.12.2022
Mehak

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