



222 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-31796-2024

Date of Decision: 01.10.2024

Balwinder Singh

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.69 dated 23.05.2022 registered under Sections 420, 506 of IPC at Police Station Sadar Jalalabad, District Fazilka.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Gurjeet Singh, who alleged that the petitioner had demanded a sum of Rs.1.50 lacs from each of the victims to provide them employment in the Agricultural Department. Out of the said amount, the victims had paid initially an amount of Rs.80,000/- and after getting the amount, the petitioner had allegedly handed over PC letters to the victims, shown to have been issued by the Department of Agriculture. Even the victims were interviewed at A.D.B. Infotec Private Limited, Mohali and had undergone the training at Global Hub of Education, Sector-34, Chandigarh. They were also issued letters regarding



training also. However, after sometime, when the victims asked the accused to provide them an employment, the petitioner started lingering on the matter and even stopped attending the calls of the victims.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved by levelling vague and unfounded allegations against them. He further contends that in fact, Rashpal Singh, co-accused had taken money from the victims and the petitioner had no concern with the allegations. Even the cheques were issued by Rashpal Singh, co-accused and no money was handed over to the petitioner ever. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 14.03.2024 and the challan has already been presented against him.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that one more case of similar nature has been registered against the petitioner. However, he admits that the petitioner is on bail in the said case.

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

6. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than 6 months. Moreover, after completion of the investigation, the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented before the competent Court. All the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time. Thus, no purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.



7. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

01.10.2024.
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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