

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

CRM-M-20580-2023

Date of Decision:-02.05.2023

Shani Singh @ Janni.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Ramta K Chaudhary, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.82 dated 13.04.2022 under Sections 458, 427, 382, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act and Section 120-B, 201 and 395 IPC added later on vide G.D. No.39 dated 19.05.2022 registered at Police Station City Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Muktsar Sahib.

The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Atal Kumar who stated that he was the owner of a marble shop in the name of Vansh Marble. He was using a mobile make Samsung touch screen with two Sims of JIO Company having number 92165-000103 and 88475- 23623. His wife Seema Rani was using one mobile make Samsung touch screen with one Sim of JIO company bearing number 75081-85002. On 12.04.2022 at about 9.00 pm 06 unidentified persons entered his house. Two of them were armed with revolver and one with baseball bat. Two were armed with Kappa and one person was armed with a dangerous weapon. Upon entering his

house, they (accused) made them (complainant and his wife) sit on the floor in one corner. All the accused persons had their faces muffled with cloth. While one person kept pointing a revolver at them, five persons ransacked the cupboard. They stole Rs.25,000/- in cash, two gold rings and three mobile phones. They also scuffled with him and snatched the mobile phones belonging to him and his wife. They also damaged the CCTV cameras installed in his house. After the occurrence they left the house. Pursuant thereto he gathered courage and approached the investigating agency leading to the registration of the FIR.

The Counsel for the petitioner contends that none of the accused have been named in the FIR but only in the supplementary statement of the complainant. Recoveries from the accused have been foisted upon them and there are number of other discrepancies in the prosecution version regarding the number of the car allegedly recovered from the petitioner. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 22.04.2022 and since none of the 19 prosecution witnesses have been examined till date, the Trial of the present case was not likely to be concluded anytime soon and, therefore, the petitioner ought to be granted the concession of bail more so when four of the co-accused namely Gaurav Ram @ Gaurav Kumar @ Guru has been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 24.11.2022 passed in CRM-M-33379-2022, Mandeep Singh has been granted bail vide order dated 07.12.2022 passed in CRM-M-55923-2022, Sanjeev Kumar @ Shibu has been granted bail vide order dated 07.12.2022 passed in CRM-M-30032-2022 and Vicky has been granted bail vide order dated 11.01.2023 passed in CRM-M-90-2023.

The Counsel for the State on the other hand contends that the petitioner and his co-accused have committed a heinous offence. They

entered the house of the complainant and ransacked the same. Theft of various articles was also committed. The seriousness of the allegations did not entitle him to the grant of bail. He however, admits that the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gaurav Ram @ Gaurav Kumar @ Guru, Mandeep Singh, Sanjiv Kumar @ Shibu and Vicky have been granted the concession of bail as also the fact that no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

I have heard learned Counsel for both the parties at length.

Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 23.04.2022. None of the 19 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded any time soon. He is a first time offender with no prior record. The veracity of the prosecution case shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. At this stage, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the petitioner-**Shani Singh @ Janni** son of Sh. Jagtar Singh is ordered to be released on bail subject to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing that he is not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.

If the petitioner or any of his family members/associates make any attempt to contract/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this Court.

In addition, the petitioner (or any one on his behalf) shall prepare a FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the

Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

Petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

May 02, 2023
Vinay

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