

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

233

**CRM-M-23472-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.07.2023**

Mohit Kumar Sangwan @ Tinku

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.232 dated 21.06.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 201 and 120-B IPC and Sections 10, 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983 at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 1 year, having been arrested on 18.07.2022. The co-accused Karamjit Singh, in whose account the amount in question was transferred by the complainant, which he further transferred to co-accused Balpreet Singh, has since been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.01.2023, Annexure P-2. The account statement regarding this has been produced in Court. Charges were

framed on 01.04.2023, however, only 1 out of 16 witnesses have been examined. The offences are triable by the Magistrate. Petitioner is involved in 2 more cases, in which he is on bail, one granted by this Court vide order dated 19.07.2023, after a custody of approximately 1 year. He places reliance 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. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that petitioner had allured the complainant on the pretext of sending his children abroad for which purpose an amount was deposited in the account of co-accused Karamjit Singh. He is however unable to controvert the submissions regarding the custody, stage of the case, co-accused on bail as well as the petitioner in other cases.

4. Heard.

5. 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".

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for more than 1 year; on bail in other cases; co-accused has been granted bail; case is triable by Magistrate; charges were framed on 01.04.2023, however, only 1 out of 16 witnesses have yet been examined; the trial is likely to take considerable time and thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, as such the present petition for grant of regular bail

deserves to be allowed.

7. 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:-

- (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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

31.07.2023

S.Sharma(syr)

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