

2024:PHHC:102561



276 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-6050-2024
Decided on:-08.08.2024

Paramjit Singh @ PammiPetitioner..

VS.

State of PunjabRespondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, AAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present second petition filed under Section 439 Cr.PC, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.60 dated 23.05.2023, registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professional (Regulations) Act, 2014 at Police Station Sadar Patiala, wherein the petitioner along with his co-accused has been implicated with the allegations of having cheated the complainant and two others for a sum of Rs.1,20,00,000/- on the pretext of sending them to USA.
2. On the other hand, the prayer has been vehemently opposed at the instance of learned State counsel while referring to the antecedents of the petitioner, who is stated to be involved in three more cases of similar nature, the details thereof are as under:-

Sr.No.	FIR No./ offence	Status
1.	FIR No.155 dated 10.03.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 384, 342, 120-B IPC and 24 of the Immigration Act, Police Station Ambala Cantt.	On bail
2.	FIR No.53 dated 04.03.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 342, 120-B, 506 IPC and 13 Immigration Act, Police Station City Rajpura	On bail
3.	FIR No.335 dated 06.11.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, Police Station City Rajpura	Not applied for bail

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

4. In the present case, investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan followed by framing of charges and trial is likely to take some time as none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far, out of the total 27 prosecution witnesses, whereas, the petitioner is in custody for the last almost 10 months.

As regards the involvement of the petitioner in other cases, as per the information provided by learned State counsel, in two cases, he is on bail and in third one, he has not applied for bail.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court does not find justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

6. In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the present petition, the same is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.08.2024

sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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