

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-49970-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.02.2023

VISHAL KUMAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. B.S. Kathuria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab.

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.128 dated 27.08.2022, under Sections 397, 379-B, 34, 201 IPC, registered at Police Station GRP, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody since 28.08.2022. Though the allegations against the petitioner are that he along with two other persons had committed robbery at the railway station. However, he was not apprehended at the spot and was implicated based on disclosure statement made by co-accused namely Vishal son of Raju Goswami and no test identification parade was conducted. He is not involved in any other case and the FIR was also lodged after a day's delay. Though, charges have been framed on 24.11.2022, however, only 1 out of 12 prosecution has yet been examined.

Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 25.02.2023, which is taken on record, as per the same the custody of the petitioner

is 5 months and 29 days. He opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner along with other co-accused had committed the robbery and an amount of Rs.15,000/- was snatched from the complainant, who later identified him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to the stage of the case and that he is not involved in any other case.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody since 28.08.2022; he is not involved in any other case; though charges have been framed on 24.11.2022, however, only 1 out of 12 prosecution witnesses has yet 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 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.

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

February 28, 2023

M.Kamra

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