

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215+108

CRM-20593-2023;
CRM-18476-2023 in/&
CRM-M-16734-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.05.2023

Navjot Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. S.S. Kamboj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab.

Mr. N.K. Awasthi, Advocate
for the complainant-respondent No.2.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

CRM-20593-2023

For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed.

Annexure P-5 is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-18476-2023

For the reasons mentioned in the application, same stands allowed.

Main case is preponed and taken on board today itself.

CRM-M-16734-2023

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case of FIR No.126 dated 08.12.2022, registered under Sections 387 and 506 IPC and Section 66-D of IT Act, at Police Station Urban Estate Patiala, District Patiala.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last 3 months. The matter stands compromised between the parties (Annexure P-2).

Challan stands presented. Charges have not been framed. In all there are 13 prosecution witnesses. Though the petitioner is involved in another FIR, which was lodged on the same day with similar allegations, in which he has been granted regular bail vide order dated 21.12.2022 (Annexure P-5). He relies on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 09.05.2023 has been filed by learned State counsel. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for the last 3 months and 7 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having threatened the complainant and demanded Rs.25 lacs. He is however unable to controvert with regard to stage of trial, compromise having been arrived at between the parties and the petitioner is on bail in the other case.

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 has been in custody for the last 3 months and 7 days; compromise has been effected between the parties; he is on bail in another case registered against him; challan has already been

presented, however, the charges are yet to be framed; in all there are 13 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

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

May 11, 2023
M.Kamra

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