

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

220 CRM-M-48727-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.09.2023

Mangal Singh @ Mangta ..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. RPS Bara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.195 dated 07.08.2020, registered under Section 304 IPC and Section 61 of Punjab Excise Act, at Police Station Kathunangal, District Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for last 3 years and about 2 months. Initially, the complainant had made a statement before the police that her husband had a natural death and none was responsible, however, on the next day, the FIR was lodged against the petitioner, due to party faction. Thus, alleges false implication. Though charges were framed on 12.03.2021, however, out of 18 witnesses, only one has been examined. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.
3. The custody certificate dated 28.09.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 3 years, 1 month and 19 days.
4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations leveled against the petitioner of having sold

the spurious liquor, on account of it having been consumed, husband of the complainant had died. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding stage of the case and the petitioner not being involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 3 years, 1 month and 19 days; not involved in any other case; charges were framed on 12.03.2021, but so far only one prosecution witness, out of 18 has been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

7. 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 his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) 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.
- (v) 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.

- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) 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.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. 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.

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

29.09.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No