

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-8979-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 31.05.2023

Dinesh Kumar @ Teji

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.113 dated 13.09.2022, registered under Sections 307, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Mohkampura, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 7 months. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner is stated to have fired in air. The statements of the complainant and injured have been recorded and they have not supported the prosecution version. Co-accused Sahil Rajput and Manpreet Singh @ Patta @ Bhatta, who were attributed injury below the waist of the complainant have been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 20.04.2023 after having custody of 7 months and noticing the factum of the two witnesses having not supported the case. 15 more prosecution witnesses remain to be examined. The petitioner is involved in 3 more cases that are pending and he is on bail. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 30.05.2023 has been filed by learned State counsel. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for the last 6 months and 29

days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are that he was a part of the unlawful assembly, who, in connivance with the co-accused had caused injuries to the complainant and there are multiple FIRs registered against him. He is however unable to controvert the submission with regard to the stage of the case, statements of the complainant and injured having been recorded but not supported the case of prosecution and co-accused having been granted regular bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (*Supra*) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

7. In view of the afore-referred judgment and facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for 6 months and 29 days; co-accused have already been granted regular bail; he is on bail in the other cases registered against him; complainant and injured stand examined, who have not supported the prosecution case; in all there are 17 prosecution witnesses; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

8. As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
2. The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
3. The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
4. The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
5. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
6. The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
7. The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.
8. The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the Trial Court forthwith and in case, he does not have the passport, he shall furnish a specific affidavit in this regard.
9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.
10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

May 31, 2023
M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No