

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

CRM-M-2387-2024

Date of Decision: 08.04.2024

Jaspal Singh alias Jaspal Singh Gill

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Vrinda Sarin, Advocate, for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.0233 dated 23.08.2023 registered under Sections 420, 120-B of IPC (Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no concern or connection with the companies, which have been mentioned by the complainant in the present case. In fact, the petitioner had joined the company, "The Kim Investment Limited in the year 2007", whereas the dispute in the present case pertains to the company namely Kim Infrastructure Development Limited. She further contends that all the aforesaid companies were being run by Ravinder Singh Sidhu and the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as unfortunately he happens to be maternal uncle of

Ravinder Singh Sidhu. She further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 25.09.2023 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. She further contends that in the present case, the petitioner has entered into a compromise with the complainant and the parties have amicably settled all the disputes.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that the petitioner has compromised the matter with the complainant and she has no objection in case the present petition is allowed by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 25.09.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 6 months. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against the petitioner. Moreover, the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties. No purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

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

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

08.04.2024.
hemlata

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