

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 7780-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.02.2023

Nawal Singh

... Petitioner

V/s.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present : Mr. Arvind Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No. 324 dated 13.09.2022, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC registered at Police Station Dharuhera, Rewari.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 21.01.2023. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner in collusion with one Shakuntala Devi and one Jile Singh sold one plot to Soniya Devi vide Vasika No. 3352 dated 28.02.2022 by preparing forged documents. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as he is neither the beneficiary nor the signatory/witness to the sale deed and even further there is no evidence available on record to connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. He further submits that the sale deed in question

co-accused Jile Singh has also been granted interim bail by this Court and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Per contra learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature, however, does not dispute the fact that the co-accused has already been granted interim bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 21.01.2023.

It is not a case made out by the respondent-State that in case concession of bail is granted to the petitioner, he would hamper the course of free and fair trial. Further, since the co-accused has been granted interim bail and the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bar.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)

JUDGE

17.02.2023

seema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes /No