

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

**CRM-M No.35758 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.02.2016**

Rohit @ Joni

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Saini, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State assisted by S.I. Suresh Kumar.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Present petition is for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioner/accused in case FIR No.329 dated 27.10.2014, under Sections 457, 380, IPC and (Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 201, 202, 216, 120-B, IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act added later on), registered with Police Station City Gohana, District Sonapat (**Annexure P-1**).

The complainant-Satish Kumar Goel was working as Senior Manager, Punjab National Bank, Gohana Branch and he reported that on 27.10.2014, the strong room of the bank had been breached and there were many lockers, which were found broken and theft of valuables committed.

The name of the petitioner has surfaced in the investigation to have supplied two Sim Cards to co-accused/non-applicants Satish and Rajesh, which were procured by the petitioner on fake IDs, in order to commit the theft from the locker at the PNB strong room.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that from the material annexed with the challan, an offence under Section 202, IPC is only made out

regarding intentionally omitting to give information regarding the theft to the authorities. He further submits that maximum punishment for the same is six months and the petitioner has already undergone more than one year and three months of custody as he is in custody since 05.11.2014. He further submits that the case is at the stage of recording of prosecution evidence.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by S.I. Suresh Kumar, does not refute the custody period and the fact of the stage of the trial.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, custody period and the facts as noticed above, this Court finds that petitioner/accused deserves the concession of regular bail and as such he is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Disposed of.

February 15, 2016

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**