

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-44793-2022
Date of decision: 16.01.2023

SHAMINDER SINGH @ SONU @ SAWINDER SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Satbir Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.232 dated 16.05.2022 under Sections 395 and 397 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, however, his name has been surfaced based on the disclosure statement of the co-accused Inderjit Kumar. He further submits that the complainant is infact dealing in poppy husk against whom, after the present FIR was lodged, the case under the NDPS Act for supplying of 9 kg. of poppy husk was registered. The petitioner has been in custody since 16.05.2022. The co-accused namely Lovepreet Singh, who was also nominated in the disclosure statement has since been granted regular bail vide order dated 16.09.2022 in CRM-M-41778-2022

(Annexure P-2), after he having been in custody for about 4 months. It is contended that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Charges have been framed on 06.09.2022, however, out of 13 prosecution witnesses, none have been examined.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there was a recovery of one *danda* effected from the petitioner. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.05.2022; the co-accused namely Lovepreet Singh, has been granted regular bail vide order dated 16.09.2022 in CRM-M-41778-2022 (Annexure P-2); charges have been framed on 06.09.2022 and out of 13 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further detention behind bars would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

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 him 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.

It is made clear that in case of any infraction of any of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

In view of the above, this Court makes it clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

January 16, 2023
Mehak

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