

209-b

2024:PHHC:006589

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36118-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision:- 18.01.2024

RAMESHWAR @ SINDER

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S. Dhillon, AAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, 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 FIR No.0396, dated 14.09.2022 under Section 120-B, 406 and 420 IPC (later on added Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC) registered at Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is no iota of evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the commissioning of the offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further contends that no specific role has been attributed by the petitioner and petitioner is behind bar since 05.12.2022.

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He submits that the petitioner induced

several persons to invest money in Crypto World Trading Company and with that *modus operandi*, he has usurped huge amount of money. It is further asserted that recovery of Rs.15 lacs has already been effected from the petitioner. Thus, he prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner is a habitual offender as is evident from the custody certificate and there is every likelihood that he will again indulge in such activities and will defraud the innocent people.

Be that as it may, the investigation in the present case stands completed, the recovery whatsoever has also stands effected from the possession of the petitioner and after framing of charges on 29.03.2023, out of total 110 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, which is enough for this Court to infer that trial will certainly take long time, therefore, the petitioner cannot be detained for an indefinite period which would also curtail his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "bail is rule and jail is an exception".

As far as the pendency of other cases is concerned as has been stated by learned State counsel, no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would lend the petitioner in a situation of denial the concession of bail.

In view of the aforesaid discussions made hereinabove, the

petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

18.01.2024

Sham/ramandeep singh

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No