

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-52029-2022 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 12.01.2023

KARAMJEET SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Ms. Ishita Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Ravindra Jain, 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.232 dated 21.06.2022, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 201, 120-B; Sections 10, 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel contends that the transaction as alleged in the FIR has been done at the hands of the son of the petitioner and he is in no way connected to the same. Furthermore, the amount as received in the account of the petitioner has already been transferred Balpreet. She submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 18.07.2022. Though there were two more cases wherein the petitioner was involved, however, he is found to be innocent in the same. There are 16 witnesses out of whom only 01 has been examined so far and the trial will take long time to conclude.

Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant opposes the bail on the ground that the amount was transferred in the account of the petitioner and specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner regarding threatening the complainant. However, they are unable to controvert the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody since 18.07.2022; no other case is pending against the petitioner; only 01 out of 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far; 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 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

January 12, 2023  
S.Sharma(syr)

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