

CRM-M-8209-2023

-1-

2023:PHHC:048980

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
224

CRM-M-8209-2023

Date of Decision: 11.04.2023

Amit Sadhana

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present: - Mr. Partap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Vikas, Advocate for the complainant.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Vakalatnama filed on behalf of complainant is taken on record.

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 257 dated 01.11.2022 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 387 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Shahzadpur, District Ambala.

As per prosecution story, complainant-Ranjit Singh had filed a complaint to the effect that the petitioner along with his co-accused, namely, Deepak Kumar and Raj Kumar, after hatching a

criminal conspiracy prepared forged and fabricated documents to get truck No. HR-63-B-2428, on rent. For the said purpose co-accused-Deepak Kumar, had also impersonated himself as Ranjit Singh-complainant. After getting the truck on rent, they did not pay the rent and also counterfeited a forged number plate of registration No. HR-73-2850. Thereafter, despite a panchayat settlement, they did not return the vehicle and demanded Rs.5,00,000/- and also threatened to kill the complainant.

Learned counsel *inter alia*, contends that petitioner has falsely been implicated in the instant case. He further contends that the matter has now been compromised between the parties. The petitioner and his co-accused have already made the payment of rent to the complainant. Petitioner is in custody since 07.12.2022. Nothing has to be recovered from him. The trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. More so, co-accused of the petitioner, namely; Raj Kumar, had already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.02.2023 (Annexure P-1). Thus, treating the case of the petitioner on the same parity as that of his co-accused, he may also be granted the concession of regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition. However, learned counsel appearing for the complainant has fairly conceded the fact that the matter has been compromised between the parties and he has no objection, in case, the present petition is allowed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the matter has been compromised between the parties, but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and petitioner-Amit Sadhana, is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

11.04.2023
rishu

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No