

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

234

CRM-M-56679-2023

Date of decision: 17.11.2023

Sandeep

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. R.K. Girdhwal, Advocate, for the complainant.

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 case FIR No.137, dated 26.04.2023, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Quila, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for about 6 months. The dispute stands settled with the complainant on 07.08.2023, Annexure P-4. A petition for quashing of FIR based on compromise is in the process of being filed. Charges were framed on 22.09.2023 and out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined. It is a case triable by the Magistrate. He is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 16.11.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 5 months and 14 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations levelled by the complainant against the petitioner of having cheated him relating to plot measuring 500 Sq. yds. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the trial, the petitioner being on bail in another case and compromise having been arrived at between the parties.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant also affirms the factum of compromise and has no objection to grant the bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for 5 months and 14 days; on bail in another case; the matter has been settled between the parties, it is a case of Magisterial trial; Charges were framed on 22.09.2023 and 12 prosecution witnesses remained to be 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

17.11.2023
Ankur

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