

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

CRM-M-59772-2022
Date of Decision:-**08.05.2023**

VIKRAM ALIAS VICKY SUTHAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

-. -

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

-. -

Present:- Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chaman Lal Pawar, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

-. -

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer is for grant of regular bail in case having FIR No.125 dated 24.10.2022 registered under Sections 452, 384, 365, 506, 323, 34 IPC, at Police Station Khuian Sarwar, District Fazilka.
2. The counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and even otherwise he is in custody for the last about 6 months and after completion of investigation, challan stands presented but it will take considerable

time for the trial to conclude. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that now the parties have effected compromise and compromise quashing petition having CRM-M-23194-2023 has been filed, wherein, today counsel for the complainant has pleaded no objection if the quashing petition is allowed. So prayer is made that the petitioner be released on regular bail.

3. Mr. Kuljit Singh, counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has not disputed the factum of compromise and filing of the aforesaid quashing petition.
4. The instant petition is resisted by the State counsel, who submits that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and he also extorted money from the complainant and further the trial is still to commence. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that compromise quashing petition filed by the petitioner is pending for today in this very Court and has also not disputed the fact that petitioner is in custody since 27.10.2022 and that after completion of investigation challan has been presented but trial is at its initial stage.
5. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.
6. In view of the fact that the petitioner is in custody since last 6 months and the trial is at its initial stage and further the matter appears to have been compromised between the parties, so no fruitful purpose is going to be served by prolonging judicial custody of the petitioner for indefinite period.

7. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

08.05.2023
Gaurav Sorot

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No