

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M-51686-2022

Date of Decision:-28.03.2023

Binchu Dass.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.75 dated 27.04.2022 under Sections 302 (379, 34, 120-B, 201 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the statement of Tarsem Singh was recorded to the effect that he had two sons Harmanpreet Singh and Gurpreet Singh and his wife Archana (deceased) was a housewife. On 27.04.2022 his son Gurpreet Singh made a telephonic call to him stating that Archana his wife was not opening the main gate of the house and when he (Gurpreet) entered the house after scaling the wall he saw his mother lying in the kitchen. On this he (complainant) reached home and saw that his wife Archana was lying in the kitchen area and had been strangled. Her ear ring and gold chain were missing. The main gate of the house was locked but the rear gate was open. He suspected that some unknown persons had

caused her death by strangulation.

Based on the said complaint the instant FIR came to be registered. During the course of the investigation a statement under Section 161 Cr.PC of one Inspector Sewa Singh was recorded on 22.06.2022 wherein he stated that Binchu Dass (petitioner) and Phool Babu Paswan made an extra judicial confession before him stating that they had killed the woman at the instance of her husband Tarsem Singh (complainant) for which they had received money.

3. The Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. His name has figured first time in the statement of Inspector Sewa Singh who on 22.06.2022 had stated that the petitioner and his co-accused had made an extra judicial confession before him admitting their guilt. It is his contention that such kind of a confession is an extremely weak piece of evidence and in the absence of any corroborative evidence, the petitioner was entitled to the grant of bail, more so when he had been in custody since 21.06.2022 and only 02 out of total 29 witnesses had been examined so far.

4. The Counsel for the State on the other hand contends that the nature of allegations did not entitle the petitioner to the grant of bail. The extra judicial confession cannot be considered to be a weak piece of evidence as has been sought to be pleaded. He however admits the period of custody and the stage of Trial.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, the only piece of evidence available against the petitioner is the extra judicial confession allegedly made by the petitioner and his co-accused before Inspector Sewa Singh on 22.06.2022, almost 02 months after the occurrence. The evidentiary value of the said statement

shall be a matter of adjudication during the course of the Trial. The petitioner is in custody since 21.06.2022 and only 02 out of 29 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, as the Trial was not likely to be concluded in the near future, his further incarceration is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Binchu Dass** son of Sh. Janardhan Dass is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present case. He shall also furnish his home address along with his mobile phone number and that of his family members to the investigating agency.

9. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

March 28, 2023
Vinay

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>