

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-63263-2023
Date of Decision: 29.01.2024

Narinder Singh Mann ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Deepak Achint, Advocate, for the complainant.

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 a regular bail in case FIR No.180 dated 01.09.2023 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B at Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as the petitioner is residing with Shivani Sharma, main accused, in Mohali. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is no allegation by the complainant that any amount was paid by the complainant to the petitioner either in cash or in the bank account of the petitioner. Even, during the course of investigation, the complainant could not bring on record any evidence to indicate that any payment was made

by the complainant to the present petitioner. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 29.09.2023 and the challan has already been presented against him. Learned counsel further contends that even though, 5 more cases were ordered to be registered against the petitioner, however, the petitioner has entered into a compromise with the complainant side in three cases.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in 05 other cases of similar nature. Learned counsel further submits that keeping in view the gravity of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail in the present case.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant also submits that the complainant had paid a sum of Rs. 1000 euros to the petitioner. He further contends that another sums of Rs.35,000/- and 50,000/- were paid to the petitioner on two different occasion by Jagraj Singh, whereas, learned State counsel submits that the amount of Rs. 1000 euros and two transactions of Rs. 35,000/- and Rs. 50,000/- are subject matter of a different complaint and the inquiries are being conducted by the police with regard to the said allegations.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to

be released on regular bail in the present case. The petitioner was arrested on 29.09.2023 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented before the competent Court. Apart from that, even though, 05 more FIRs were ordered to be registered against the petitioner, but as per the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner entered into a compromise in 03 other criminal cases.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

29.01.2024
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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