

215 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16878-2023
Decided on : 18.04.2023

Satnam Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Kulbir Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

This is the second petition filed under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.114 dated 17.11.2022 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 474 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station City Morinda District Rupnagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was just a mediator in the agreement to sell qua the property in question. Learned counsel submits that totally fabricated allegations have been levelled against the petitioner of having prepared forged documents and thereafter having induced the complainant to enter into an agreement to sell with respect to the property in question. Learned counsel further submits that challan stands presented and all the offences are triable by the Magistrate. In the circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no

useful purpose as charges have not yet been framed.

Per contra learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by the counsel opposite has controverted the submissions made by the counsel qua the petitioner being a mediator with respect to the sale of the land in question. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was an active participant in the crime in question and had prepared a forged agreement to sell with respect to the land measuring 29 acres, which was in the name of his uncle, who had expired on 09.12.2019, by impersonating him. Learned counsel for the State submits that charges are likely to be framed on the next date of hearing.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

The petitioner has been in custody since 03.12.2022 for offences triable by the Magistrate. There is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future as charges have not yet been framed coupled with the fact that as many as 10 prosecution witnesses have been cited by the Investigating Agency.

Hence, in the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction to the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove

shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

18.04.2023
sonia

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