

2024:P-IHC:1' 7640



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.269

CRM-M-29184-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 09.09.2024

Kuldeep Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Thind, DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C. has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.19 dated 29.01.2023, under Sections 379-B, 323, 506, 341 & 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Dhanaula, District Barnala.

2. The facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant-Mandeep Singh alleging that on 28.01.2023, he was going to his house from Mana Patti Dharmshala. When he reached near the Government School, Mana Patti at about 08:30 p.m., then one swift car came there which was being driven by Guri Singh son of Butta Singh resident of Bhatthal. Thereafter, he was surrounded by Guri Singh and other persons and was beaten by them. One person hit him with a kadda and other person snatched a silver chain and Guri stolen Rs.2500/- and his aadhaar card.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has not been named in the FIR

2024:P-IHC:1' 7640



and the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He submits that the petitioner has undergone actual custody of 06 months and 04 days and there is another case registered against him in which he is not on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. He has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone actual custody of 06 months and 04 days and is involved in another case in which he is not on bail. He on instructions from SI-Malkit Singh submits that the challan has been presented and charges have been framed on 11.07.2024. Out of a total of 13 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He however, submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the allegations leveled against the petitioner shall be established during the course of the trial. Admittedly, challan has been presented and charges have been framed. Out of a total 13 prosecution witnesses, none of the prosecution witness have been examined. The petitioner has not been named in the FIR and he has undergone actual custody of 06 months and 04 days. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the petitioner will not serve any purpose.

2024:P-IHC:1' 7640



7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in one more criminal case, reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382** in which it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in another case. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

“As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc.”

8. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. The petitioner shall also abide by the following conditions:-

- (I) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (II) The petitioner will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(s).
- (III) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.

2024-P-IHC:1' 7640



(IV) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused of, or for commission of which he is suspected.

(V) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

9. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.

10 However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

09.09.2024

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No