

213

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-6027 of 2024
Date of decision:- 09.02.2024

RANJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.

Present:- Mr. Harpreet S. Rakhra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit Singh Cheema, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular in the following case (Annexure P-1):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
53	26.07.2023	379-B(2), 341, 212, 216, 120-B, 34 IPC and 25 and 27 of Arms Act.	Mehta, Amritsar, District Amtrisar (Rural)

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by accused Jagdish Singh @ Disha with whom the petitioner has no concern. He submits that even otherwise no specific

overt act has been attributed to the petitioner nor he is in any manner involved on the occurrence and is in custody since 15.09.2023, as such he prays for grant of concession of bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application by submitting that the petitioner is alleged to have harboured the accused Amritpal Singh after commission of crime and as such he has actively participated in the same, hence he is not entitled for concession of bail.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the present case was registered on the statement of Jagdeep Singh stating that on 26.07.2023 he was returning to his village after making collection on behalf of finance company when two motorcyclist intercepted and at gun point snatched the bag containing ₹1,20,000/- and two mobile phones. He stated that while leaving the pillion rider had fired a shot which hit his left foot. As per the case of prosecution during investigation it is revealed that motorcycle was driven by Amritpal Singh and the allegations against the petitioner is that he had harbored said Amritpal Singh. The petitioner is in custody since 15.09.2023, the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time to ascertain criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner and no purpose would be served by detaining petitioner any longer.

5. Resultantly, without commenting on the merits of the case, it is observed that no purpose would be served in keeping petitioner behind bars. Therefore, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

09.02.2024

<i>Gyan</i>	i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
	ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No