

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-4175-2024
DECIDED ON:31.01.2024

PARAMJEET SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. ADS Sukhija, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C., has been invoked seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 398, dated 05.12.2023, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Tripuri, District Patiala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the case of the prosecution is highly doubtful and while arguing, he refers to the cash transaction to the tune of Rs.47,00,000/-, which is alleged to have been paid to the petitioner and Gagandeep Singh on different occasions and that too by borrowing from different people.
3. Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab, who is appearing on advance notice has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He did not dispute the fact that the transaction is in case and offences are triable by Magistrate wherein, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of one month and 21 days, as of now.

4. Looking into the intensity of the allegations wherein the story putforth by the prosecution is highly improbable at the hand of complainant, who himself is a public servant and giving such a huge amount in cash, added with the fact that though the investigation in the present case is complete and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, as has been candidly admitted by learned State counsel, this Court is of the considered view that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

5. In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. In view of the afore-said terms, the present petition is allowed.

7. However, it is clear that anything stated hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

31.01.2024

sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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