

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

217/2

CRM-M-17747-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.05.2023

Sidhant Sehgal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Ms. Monita Mehta 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.104 dated 20.06.2018, registered under Sections 307, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Division No.2, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel contends that petitioner is in custody for the last 3 years and 7 months. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by showing that he made a disclosure statement in another FIR. The weapon that is also shown to have been recovered was in fact recovered in the said case and as per FSL report, Annexure P-4, the cartridge recovered in this case did not match with the said weapon. The injury attributed to the petitioner is on the leg of the complainant which was declared simple in nature. There are 24 witnesses, however as of now the case has not even been committed to the Court of Sessions. As regards 7 FIRs pending against the petitioner, she relies 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 15.05.2023 filed by learned State

counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind the bars for the last 3 years, 7 months and 8 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had conspired with the co-accused and allegedly fired gunshots at the complainant causing injury at his leg. There are 7 more cases pending against him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions regarding the stage of the trial and his involvement is based on his disclosure statement made in the other case, wherein he is involved.

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 the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 3 years, 7 months and 8 days; injuries attributed to the petitioner were simple in nature; in all there are 24 witnesses; the case has not even been committed to the Courts of Sessions; 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 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.
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

16.05.2023

S.Sharma(syr)

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No