

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM M-42807 of 2023
Date of Decision: 10.10.2023

Mrinank Singh ...Petitioner
Vs.
State of Punjab and another ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.92 dated 29.07.2023 registered under Sections 419 and 420 IPC at Police Station 8 Phase, Mohali, SAS Nagar.
2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of statement made by Vijay Singh Dogra, who stated that he had received a telephonic call from someone and the caller was addressing himself as ADGP, Chandigarh. He asked the complainant to book certain tickets for his relatives and to book the hotel accommodation. Even subsequently, the tickets and hotel accommodations were booked by the complainant on the asking of the accused. The complainant had made the payment of Rs. 1,51,427/- online. Later on,

the caller again called him up and asked him to make the payment of Rs. 3,74,000/- at Amritsar for a watch. The complainant made the said payment also, but later on, it was found that the caller had impersonated as ADGP, Chandigarh. With these allegations, the FIR in the present case was registered. During the course of investigation, Raghav Goyal and Mrinank Singh were nominated as accused in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons and the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case only on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 30.07.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 02 months. After completion of the investigation, the challan has already been presented before the concerned Court and his further custody will serve no meaningful purpose. He further contends that all the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate and the petitioner deserves the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the amount has not been recovered from the petitioner so far and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned

10.10.2023

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

amit rana

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No