



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-4780-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.08.2024

SUKHPREET SINGH
STATE OF PUNJAB

VERSUS

....Petitioner
....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. S.S. Nagra, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition has been made for extending benefit of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.37 registered under Sections 379, 411, 406 & 407 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Joga, District Mansa. He along with co-accused is facing trial in this case. As submitted, the petitioner had been extended benefit of regular bail in the aforementioned case on 03.06.2017. However, he was subsequently arrested in some other case and detained in District Jail, Hisar. He failed to appear before the trial Court from 11.05.2022 onwards. His bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Subsequently, proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C were initiated against him. He was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 03.10.2022. He had been arrested again and is in custody since 25.05.2023. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is in custody since long. He had moved an application for grant of bail before the learned trial Court which had been dismissed vide order dated 08.01.2024.

2. It is relevant to mention here that vide order dated 06.02.2024, the petitioner was ordered to be released on interim bail. It is argued by learned



counsel for the petitioner that he has remained in custody for sufficiently long period. He is regularly attending the proceedings before the learned trial Court. He has not misused the concession of interim bail granted to him vide order dated 06.02.2024. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Therefore, it is argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

2. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner may misuse the concession of bail and abscond again and, therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. Heard.

5. The petitioner absented from trial in the aforementioned FIR. He was arrested on 25.05.2023. Presently, he is on interim bail. It is not the contention of the respondent-State that he has misused the concession of interim bail so granted to him. The trial is about to conclude as submitted by learned State counsel.

6. In view of above facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the order dated 06.02.2024 granting him benefit of interim bail is confirmed. No direction is issued for furnishing fresh bonds by the petitioner as he has already furnished the same before the learned trial Court.

21.08.2024
Deepak Patwal

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned
- : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable
- : Yes/No