

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-50735-2022
Date of decision: 11.04.2023

Bharat Chauhan @ Mithu

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Yashasvi Kapila, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. Sullar, Sr. 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. 103 dated 07.05.2019 under Sections 307, 353, 186, 224, 225, 379-B, 34, 120-B and 411 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 3 years and 3 months having been arrested on 03.01.2020. He was not named in the FIR. It is on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused Manpreet Singh that the petitioner was implicated in the case and the recovery has not been effected from the petitioner. Challan has been presented on 13.08.2019 and supplementary challan has been presented on 27.02.2020 but the charges have not been framed and in all there are 35 prosecution witnesses.

Custody certificate filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record as per which the petitioner has been in custody for the last 3 years, 3 months and 8 days.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence and he is an habitual offender. However, he is unable to controvert the other submissions with regard to the stage of the trial.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and in particular that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 3 years, 3 months and 8 days; though challan has been presented, however, charges are yet to be framed and in total there are 35 prosecution witnesses; 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 his 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, she does not have the passport, she 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

11.04.2023

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