

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

215-1

CRM-M-28780-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.08.2023

Manpreet Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. JS Thind, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.8 dated 13.01.2020, registered under Sections 302,506,341,120-B,212,216,201 IPC, Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act and Sections 21, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Kartarpur, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 3 years. He was not named in the FIR and his name surfaced based on disclosure statement of co-accused Sumit Kumar @ Noni. The allegation against him is of having harboured the accused after he committed the offence. He was not present at the time of commission of offence and no recovery has been effected from him. Similarly situated co-accused Simranjit Singh @ Sima s/o Malkit Singh, has been granted regular bail vide order dated 22.03.2021 (Annexure P4), after having been in custody for 8 months. He is involved in one more case under NDPS Act and two under IPC, wherein he was convicted. However, there is no

case pending trial against him. Reliance is placed 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. Charges were framed on 13.01.2020, however, only 3 out of 33 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

3. Reply on behalf of respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel. Same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that in connivance with other co-accused, petitioner had committed the murder of Jagjit Singh and that he is involved in three more cases. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the custody, stage of the trial and co-accused having been granted bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court 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." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in

particular that the petitioner is in custody for more than 3 years; his name surfaced based on disclosure statement of co-accused Sumit Kumar @ Noni; co-accused Simranjit Singh @ Sima has been granted bail; though charges were framed on 13.01.2020 but only 3 out of 33 witnesses have yet been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, 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:-

- (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.

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 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.

03.08.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No