

**CRM-M-16185-2024****-1-****228 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Decided on : 15.05.2024

CRM-M-16185-2024

Gurjit Singh @ Jita

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M-16410-2024

Ravi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. D.S.Bhinder, Advocate and
Mr. S.S.Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-16185-2024.

Mr. B.S.Bhalla, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-16410-2024.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

This order of mine shall dispose of above-said two petitions as both of them have arisen out of the same FIR. Brief facts of the case are taken from CRM-M-16185-2024.

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.17 dated 02.03.2024 under

**CRM-M-16185-2024****-2-**

Sections 384, 386, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Moga District Moga.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that even as per the case of the prosecution no phone call was ever made by either of the petitioner(s) to the complainant demanding alleged ransom; the only allegation levelled against the petitioner(s) is that he/they was/were standing alongwith the co-accused Jaswant, who had allegedly phoned up the complainant and asked him to come to the relevant spot for settling the dispute. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that even as per the case of the prosecution, not a single penny was demanded by the petitioner(s) and whatever money was received, it was received by the co-accused Jaswant Singh.

3. On a pointed query put to learned counsel for the petitioner(s) as to whether he/they have criminal antecedents, they have replied in the negative.

It has also been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner(s) that since the investigation in the case in hand is complete and even the charges stand framed, further incarceration of the petitioner would sever no useful purpose as 11 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.

4. Per contra learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the learned counsel opposite has not

disputed the factual aspect of the roles attributed to both the petitioner(s). It has also not been disputed that the investigation in the case is complete and charges stand framed. On further query, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gurdev Singh, has also not controverted that the petitioner(s) is/are not involved in any other case.

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

6. The petitioner(s) has been in custody since 02.03.2024. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as charges stands framed. The trial would take considerable time to conclude as 11 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.

7. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner(s). Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner(s) be admitted to bail on his/their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.05.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No