

**IN THE COURT OF NEERAJ GOYAL,
SUB DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
MALOUT, UID NO. PB0365
BA/378/2023**

State vs Raj Kumar @ Raju.

FIR No. 12 dated 19.01.2018

Under Section:- 457,380,473,411 IPC.

Police Station: City Malout.

Present:- Sh. G.S.Sidhu Adv. Counsel for the applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh.**

Shri Harjot Singh, APP for the State.

Main file was fixed for 11.08.2023 but has been put up today along with bail application.

Record perused. Heard on the bail application moved on behalf of applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh.** In support of the bail application, it has been submitted that the present bail application is the first regular bail application of accused /applicant. Neither such bail application of applicant/accused has been decided nor pending in any court of law. The accused /applicant has been falsely implicated in this case and accused /applicant is innocent. The story mentioned in the FIR is wrong and self made. Nothing has been recovered from the accused /applicant. The allegations levelled in the FIR are false and baseless. The completion of trial will take long time and no useful purpose will be served by keeping the applicant behind the bars. The applicant / accused undertakes to abide by all the terms and conditions which may be imposed by the Court. Thus, prayed for concession of bail to applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh.**

On the other hand, the learned APP for the State orally opposed the bail application and has not filed any written reply. He submitted that the applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh** has committed serious offence, so he should not be released on

bail.

Heard. Record perused. From a careful consideration of the rival contentions, it is to be stated that the applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh** is in custody in the present case since **28.07.2023**. Considering the nature of the offence i.e. theft of cash, safe, batteries, inventors and other computer articles etc., date of occurrence and the fact that trial of case will take long time and thus no useful purpose will be served by detaining the accused / applicant in custody for indefinite period in this case, especially when challan in this case has already been presented after completion of investigation, which means that accused / applicant is not required for custodial interrogation and co-accused are already on bail, so, **it seems that lenient view should be taken against accused / applicant Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh**. So considering the aforesaid facts, lenient view is taken against the applicant / accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh** and further no useful purpose will be served by detaining him in custody during the proceedings of the present case and even otherwise it is not the case of the prosecution that if released on bail, accused / applicant will tamper with the prosecution witnesses.

So, in view of my aforesaid observations, **the present bail application filed on behalf of applicant / accused Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh is allowed** and **applicant / accused Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh is ordered to be released on bail** on his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/-, with one surety of the like amount, with the conditions that he will not tamper with the prosecution evidence and appear in the court on each and every date of hearing. **Requisite bail bonds and surety bonds have not been furnished.**

Copy of this order be sent to applicant/accused **Raj Kumar @ Raju son of Jai Singh** through concerned Jail Superintendent through e-mail immediately in compliance of

State vs Raj Kumar @ Raju
BA No. 378/2023

3
CNR No. PBSMB1-003742-2023

order dated 31.01.2023 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in
Suo Moto Writ Petition (Cri.) No.4 of 2021 RE: Policy
Strategy for grant of bail.

Now file be put upon date already fixed i.e.
11.08.2023.

Date of Order: 09.08.2023
(Prabha, Steno-I)
“Dictated Directly”

(Neeraj Goyal)
SDJM/Malout
UID No. PB0365