

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M-26564-2023

Date of decision: 01.06.2023

Jagmeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. G. S. Bedi, Advocate and
Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner
Mr. H. S. Sullar, Sr. 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. 71 dated 12.04.2020, registered under Sections 307, 323, 324, 326, 353, 186, 332, 335, 148, 149, 188, 427, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Section 51 of the Disaster Management Act 2005 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 at Police Station Sadar, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel contends that petitioner has been in custody for the last about 3 years 29 days having been arrested on 02.05.2020. As per the FIR, the attribution to him is of causing the injury on the elbow of Bikar Singh-complainant and knee of ASI Raj Singh. Though, charges were framed on 12.10.2020, however, only 6 out of 54 prosecution witnesses have been examined. The complainant as well as injured witnesses stand examined. Co-accused who was also attributed similar injuries, has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 20.03.2023, Annexure P-6 after having been in custody for 2 years 10 months and 21 days. The petitioner is involved in one more case, in

which he is on bail. In this regard, he relies on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for the last 3 years 29 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner actively participated alongwith the co-accused and had attacked the police party who were on duty. He is involved in one more case. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to the stage of the case, he being on bail in other case and the co-accused having been granted bail.

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 that the petitioner has been in custody for 3 years 29 days; co-accused has been granted bail; charges have been framed, however, 6 out of 54 prosecution witnesses have been examined including the complainant and injured; the trial is likely to take 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 clear that in case of any infraction 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 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

01.06.2023

Mehak

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