



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

241

CRM-M-24883-2024
Date of decision: May 22, 2024

RONI MITRA
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
with ASI Jatinder Pal.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.67 dated 04.12.2023 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (and Section 384 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Handesra, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the allegations that he was part of a gang, which had been forging registration certificates (RCs) of luxury cars and thereafter, selling them off. Learned counsel submits that after the challan was presented on 04.03.2024, the trial had not made much headway as charges had not been framed. Hence, the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future did not arise, moreso since 16 witnesses had been cited by the prosecution.
3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions, has not disputed that the stage of trial and also that investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. He, however, has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR that the petitioner was part of a gang, which had been selling luxury vehicles on forged documents.



4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.
5. In a magisterial trial, the petitioner has now been in custody since 06.12.2023. 16 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and hence, trial would take considerable time to conclude as even the charges have not yet been framed. Co-accused of the petitioner have already been extended the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 05.04.2024 and 03.04.2024 (Annexure P-3 and P-4 respectively).
6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, coupled with the fact that the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future does not arise, this Court deems it fit to allow the instant petition and extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.
7. The petition as such is allowed, and the petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. 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.
8. Needless to add here, in case the petitioner is found misusing the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to approach this Court to seek cancellation of bail to him.

May 22, 2024
Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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