

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-50506-2022
Date of decision: 16.01.2023

PUNEET PAL SINGH GILL

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sanchit Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate
for the complainant.

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.221 dated 29.07.2022 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

Learned Senior Counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody since 15.09.2022, the challan has been presented and charges have been framed on 06.01.2023. The allegations against the petitioner that he had illegally entered into an agreement to sell with one Karnail Singh Bishnoi, regarding the land in question and that he had siphoned off Rs.10.5 lakh, from his father, who is the complainant, stand belied from the vital fact of the matter that prior to lodging of the FIR, the complainant himself executed the sale deed on 22.07.2022 in favour of the wife of Karnail Singh, in terms of the agreement and in the sale deed, the

amount aforesaid also stands mentioned.

Learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel for the complainant oppose the bail on the ground that allegations against the petitioner are of having forged the documents and opened an account in the name of his father and withdrew an amount of Rs.10.5 lakh therefrom and it is not the first time that the petitioner has indulged in an act, such as the one involved in the present case, but even previously twice over he has siphoned off the amount as well as, had also sold the car of his mother.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody since 15.09.2022; charges have been framed but the trial is yet to commence, which 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 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 in any manner 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