

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

215

CRM-M-13802-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.08.2023

Amanpreet Singh @ Aman

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. KS Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.8 dated 13.01.2020, registered under Sections 302,506,341,120-B,212,216,201 IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 21 and 29 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Kartarpur, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 3 years. Though he was named in the FIR and allegation of having fired shots has been leveled against him, however, the same did not hit anyone and the single injury that was fatal to victim-Jagjit Singh, was attributed to Simranjit Singh @ Sima son of Malhut Singh, who has expired. There is no allegation as regards the offence under the NDPS is concerned. Co-accused Sukhwant Singh @ Sukhpal @ Sukha @ Nikka, who is similarly placed to the petitioner, has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 20.02.2023 passed in CRM-M-33968-2022 (Annexure P2), after having been in custody for more than 2 years. Charges were framed on 13.01.2020, however, only 3 witnesses,

out of 33 witnesses have been examined. The petitioner is involved in one more case, which under IPC, wherein he is on bail. 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 02.08.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 3 years and 17 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner is involved in the conspiracy of commission of the murder of Jagjit Singh and had also fired a shot, though did not hit anyone. A pistol was also recovered from him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the trial and co-accused having been granted bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court 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. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 3 years; co-accused has been granted bail; though charges were framed on 13.01.2020 but only 3 out of 33 witnesses have yet been examined; the

trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, 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:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) 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.
- (v) 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.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) 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.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

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.

03.08.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No