



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

CRM-M-64771-2024
Date of Decision: 10.01.2025

Jashandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Goldy Jakhar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.58 dated 19.04.2022 under Sections 409, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 201 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was lodged by the BDPO, wherein, allegations regarding embezzlement of money pertaining to MNREGA scheme were made. During enquiry, the petitioner was also nominated as one of the accused. He was arrested on 02.10.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 29.11.2024. Hence, the petitioner approached this Court praying for grant of bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He



has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were qua the embezzlement of money pertaining to MNREGA scheme, however, the same have not been substantiated from any evidence on record. He submits that similarly situated co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. It is submitted that bail petition filed by the petitioner was declined by the trial Court primarily on the ground that the case was under investigation, however, investigation is now completed and challan already stands filed. It is submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that complicity of the petitioner was established during the enquiry. She has submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case as per custody certificate. On instructions from ASI Jawinder Singh, she submits that the investigation is complete and case is fixed for framing of charges.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 02.10.2024. Co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. Investigation already stands completed and the challan is also presented. Custody certificate produced by the State counsel would show that the petitioner is behind bars from the last more than three months. Though he is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both



the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

10.01.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No