



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107+212

CRM-45460-2024 in/and
CRM-M-40768-2024
Date of decision: November 22nd, 2024

Pinder Sodhi
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Shivansh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-45460-2024

Prayer in this application is for placing on record statement
of PW-3 Palwinder Singh as Annexure P-7.

Application is allowed subject to just exceptions.

Annexure P-7 is taken on record.

CRM-M-40768-2024

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR
No.20 dated 28.08.2023 under Sections 7, 7-A of the Prevention of
Corruption Act, 1988, and Sections 384, 420, 511 and 120-B of the IPC
registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the
petitioner was arrested on 29.02.2024, not only had the charges been
framed but the sole material witness in the present case i.e. the
complainant examined. Hence, the possibility of the petitioner



CRM-45460-2024 in/and CRM-M-40768-2024

-2-

tampering with evidence or intimidating the witnesses now did not arise. It has further been submitted that out of the 16 prosecution witnesses, four witnesses, which also include the most material witness i.e. the complainant stand examined. Hence, his further incarceration would serve no useful purpose.

3. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite has not disputed the custody period as well as the stage of trial. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that in the present case, the sole material witness i.e. the complainant already stands examined. However, it has been submitted by the learned State counsel that the complainant, during his deposition before the trial Court, had stood his ground and supported the case of the prosecution. It has further been argued by the learned State counsel that there are serious allegations against the petitioner in the FIR in question. Besides, the petitioner is involved in a number of other cases under Section 420 of the IPC.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 29.02.2024. The FIR in question came to be lodged at the instance of complainant-Palwinder Singh, who has since been examined. Undisputedly, he is the sole material witness in the present case.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, more so since 12 witnesses still remain to be examined, the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future, hence, further incarceration of



CRM-45460-2024 in/and CRM-M-40768-2024 **-3-**

the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. 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 say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

November 22nd, 2024
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No