

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

242

CRM-M-34771-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.08.2023

Praveen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition is for grant regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.8 dated 05.01.2019, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 201 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sadar Kanina, District Mahendergarh. Vide order dated 03.08.2022 passed by this Court in CRM-M-41006-2020, Section 132(1)(B)(C) of HGST Act, 2017 has been quashed.
2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 16.08.2023 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Mahendergarh, already filed in the Registry is taken on record. Copy of the same has been handed over to the learned counsel petitioner in the Court.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner and co-accused, namely, Charan Singh, is that they have got registered a firm, namely, M/s Poonam Industries, in the name of Poonam wife of Sanjay; that the said act was alleged to have been done at the behest of Anupam Singla; that the said firm is stated to be a fake one; that the role attributed to the petitioner and co-accused, namely, Charan Singh, is that they

used to collect some documents in the shape of Aadhaar Card and PAN Card and that the similarly situated co-accused/Charan Singh, who is also involved in other cases, has since been granted the concession of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that it is a Magisterial trial and the petitioner has been in custody since 30.07.2020.

5. Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime and the recovery of Rs.30,000/- has been effected from him. The petitioner is a habitual offender. However, she does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 30.07.2020. Similarly placed co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. The conclusion of the trial would take time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

29.08.2023
Mangal Singh

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