

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

CRM-M-33412-2023

Date of Decision:-23.08.2023

Ramandeep Bindra.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. Raj Kumar Rana, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG Haryana.

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.290 dated 11.05.2023 under Sections 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Ambala City, Ambala.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Para Bhalla who stated that one Ramandeep Singh Bindra (petitioner) was known to him. On 17.04.2023 while he was sitting in the Bar Room at the District Court, Ambala, Ramandeep Singh Bindra came to meet him. At the same time one of his (complainant's) client whose vehicle had been impounded by the RTA, Ambala Cantt and had been challaned for Rs.50,000/- by the RTA office was discussing the same with him (complainant). At that time Ramandeep Singh Bindra (petitioner) stated that he could get the vehicle released on a decreased challan value. Based on this assurance a sum of Rs.25,000/- was paid to him (petitioner). However, the work as promised of decreasing the challan amount was not got done. Finally a sum of Rs.23,000/- was returned but Rs.2000/- was retained as balance amount. Legal action was sought against the accused.

3. The counsel for the petitioner contends that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled against him in the FIR are completely baseless. As the petitioner was in custody since

11.05.2023 and none of the 06 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far after the filing of the report under Section 173(2) Cr.PC, the petitioner was entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The Counsel for the State on the other hand contends that the petitioner did not deserve the concession of bail in view of the serious nature of the allegations. He however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 11.05.2023 and none of the 06 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. As the petitioner is in custody since 11.05.2023 and none of the 06 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, therefore the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Ramandeep Bindra** of Sh. Kuldeep Singh is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

August 23, 2023
Vinay

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