

CRM-M-2001-2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2001-2023

Date of decision: 18.04.2023

Surjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Gurpal Singh Sandhu, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rishu Madan, AAG, Punjab.

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Through this fourth petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.46 dated 22.04.2021, registered under Sections 379, 413 IPC and Sections 411 and 473 IPC (added later on), at Police Station Bajakhana, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that recovery has already been effected; that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.04.2021, and that co-accused, namely, Jagseer Singh, Karamjit Singh @ Motu, Surjit Singh @ Dilli, Nachhattar Singh, Sanjeev Kumar @ Ashu Ram and Jasveer Singh alias Gaggu have since been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Benches. So far as four other cases registered or pending against the petitioner, are concerned, he has since been acquitted in two cases whereas he has been convicted in one case and is still facing the trial in one case.

**CRM-M-2001-2023**

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is a member of the gang involved in stealing the valuable cooper and oil from the transformers installed in the fields and that a huge recovery of copper had been effected from the house of the petitioner. She further submits that there are as many as four other cases registered or pending against the petitioner and the aforesaid fact speaks volumes about his brazen antecedents.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Though the allegations levelled against the petitioner, are serious in nature, yet the fact remains that he has been in custody since 22.04.2021 and that the aforesaid co-accused have since been granted the concession of bail. In view of the principle of parity coupled with the fact that trial is unlikely to conclude any time soon, this Court finds that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

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

**18.04.2023**

parveen kumar

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)  
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No