

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-13235-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.03.2023

SANDEEP SINGH@SIPPY

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Ms. Riffi Bala Birla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, Sr. DAG Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.15 dated 02.02.2021, under Sections 365, 307, 342, 323, 148, 149 IPC, registered at Police Station City-I, Abohar, District Fazilka.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 9 months and 8 days. The attribution to the petitioner is of having inflicted the injury by wooden stick on the legs of the complainant. Similarly placed co-accused Sandeep Singh attributed the same role and also of having caught hold of the complainant, has since granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 08.08.2022, Annexure P-2. The injuries attracting Section 307 have been attributed to co-accused Binny. The charges have been framed on 16.05.2022 and in all, there are 20 witnesses and the complainant stands examined, who has not supported the version of the prosecution. Though, the petitioner is involved in 4 other criminal cases and even co-accused Sandeep Singh, who has been granted regular bail, was also involved in two other cases. In this regard he relies on the judgment dated 16.01.2012 passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in Criminal Appeal

No.159 of 2012 titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2012(2) SCC 382.**

Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 21.03.2023, which is taken on record, as per the same the custody of the petitioner is 1 year 9 months and 8 days. He opposes the bail on the ground that they all in connivance with each other had caused injuries to the complainant, however, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of trial and the complainant having been examined as PW-1 as reflected in the order dated 02.02.2023.

Heard.

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."

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year 9 months and 8 days; co-accused Sandeep Singh had been granted regular bail; charges were framed on 16.05.2022; in all, there are 20 witnesses, out of whom, complainant stands examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further detention behind bars would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

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 him 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.

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.

In view of the above, this Court makes it clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

March 22, 2023

M.Kamra

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