

254

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

CRM-M-23276-2025

Date of Decision:06.05.2025

YOGRAJ SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

...RESPONDENTS

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat


Present : Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.123 dated 13.08.2024, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC & Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, Police Station Ranjit Avenue, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled by the complainant in the present case are vague and unfounded. Even otherwise, no specific allegation was levelled against the present petitioner. He next contends that basically there was a financial dispute between the parties and now with the introduction of the respectable, both the parties have entered into a compromise by the Compromise Deed (Annexure P-2). The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 05.02.2025 and after completion of investigation, the challan has been presented against him.



3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant admits the factum of compromise (Annexure P-2) and submits that he has no objection in case the present petition is allowed by this Court. He has also filed his power of attorney on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant, which is taken on record.

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

6. Admittedly, there were certain financial transactions between the parties, however, vide the Compromise Deed (Annexure P-2), the parties have entered into a settlement and learned counsel for the complainant has not objected to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner. Even otherwise, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about 03 months and challan has been presented against him. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

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

06.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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