

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M-27713-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.07.2023

Vinod Kumar @ Rangila

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Sandeep S. Majithia, 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 grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.103 dated 07.05.2019, registered under Sections 307, 353, 186, 224, 225, 34, 379-B and 120-B IPC (Section 411 IPC added subsequently) and Section 25/27 of Arms Act at Police Station City Kapurthala.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for almost 4 years and 1 month. His name has surfaced based on disclosure statement of co-accused, as per which it was alleged that he along with the others had participated in the offence whereby an accused was got released from the custody of the police while on the way to the hospital. He submits that the allegations of having fired shots are against co-accused Swaran Singh, who is in custody. The trial is not progressing, as even the charges have not been framed and in all there are 35 witnesses. Two co-accused namely Manpreet Kaur @ Dolly and Vishal Singh have been granted regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 05.09.2019 and

21.11.2019 (Annexures P2 and P3). Though, the petitioner is involved in other cases, however, he is on bail in all of them. 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.

3. The custody certificate dated 23.07.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 4 years and 28 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of the crime which is serious in nature. There are multiple FIRs lodged against him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the case, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioner being on bail in other cases.

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 the last 4 years and 28 days; co-accused have been granted bail; though the petitioner is involved in other cases, however, he is on bail in all of them; charges are yet to be framed and in total there are 35 witnesses; 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.

24.07.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No