



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39497-2024

Date of Decision:05.09.2024

Avtar Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : **Hon’ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present : Mr. Suneet Pal Singh Aulakh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No. 219 dated 20.04.2024, registered under Sections 406,420 and 120-B of IPC, Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad (Annexure P-1).
2. A status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the complainant also, he had talked to Manisha co-accused on phone to introduce him to Mankush, co-accused, who was the proprietor of the firm. He further contends that the entire negotiation with the complainant were handled by Manisha and Mankush, both co-accused. Learned counsel further contends that several amounts were transferred in the account of the petitioner from time to time, however, the petitioner had further transferred the amount in the account

of Mankush. He further contends that the Manisha, co-accused was arrested by the police and she has already been granted the concession of bail by the Court. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 24.06.2024 and the challan has already been presented against him.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had accepted a huge amount from the complainant and other victims. He further contends that one more case of similar nature was registered against the petitioner and the present petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner was arrersted on 24.06.2024 and after completion of the investigation, the challan has already been presented before the Court. All the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

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

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

05.09.2024
hitesh

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