



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

205

CRM-M-51126-2024

Date of decision: 20.11.2024

Satwinder Singh@ Maula

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.105, dated 27.11.2021, registered under Sections 148, 149, 201, 307, 323, 324, 325, 326, 458, 459 IPC at Police Station Khanauri, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for 1 year and about 1 month. It is in a supplementary statement of the complainant made after 2 months and 4 days of lodging of FIR that the petitioner was named, with allegations of having inflicted injuries on the legs, however no weapon has been recovered from him. The injury attracting the offence under Section 307 has been attributed to co-accused Sabar, who has been granted bail, vide order dated 21.11.2022 passed in CRM-M-47986-2022. Besides him, co-accused Krishan and



Prem Singh have also been granted bail vide orders dated 14.11.2022 and 10.07.2024, against whom there were other cases pending. Charges were framed on 18.07.2022, however, out of 28 prosecution witnesses, only 05 have been examined. The petitioner is involved in 11 cases, out of which, 2 are under IPC, 8 under Excise Act and 1 under the NDPS, wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of affidavit dated 19.11.2024 and custody certificate, which are taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year and 2 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the complainant has specifically named the petitioner in the supplementary statement, who actively participated in the commission of the offence, is an habitual offender and involved in other cases as well. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding stage of the case, the petitioner being on bail in other cases and co-accused having been enlarged on bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (supra) had held that, "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." Reiterating



in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, “The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year and 2 days; is on bail in other cases; co-accused have been granted bail; charges were framed on 18.07.2022; out of a total of 28 prosecution witnesses, only 5 have been examined so far; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

8. As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall 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 witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.



- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

20.11.2024
Hemant

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