

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

CRM-M-37578-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 26.10.2016

Parveen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
assisted by ASI Karanbir Singh.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in FIR No.521 dated 02.05.2016, registered under Section 379-B of the Indian Penal Code, at P.S. City Panipat.

Contentends that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR, nor has he been identified by the complainant in the Court. The complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution. The petitioner is not involved in any other FIR.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the instant petition. On instructions, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner and his co-accused snatched one motorcycle and a mobile phone from the complainant. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, the mobile phone was recovered from the petitioner. He further states that out of nine prosecution witnesses, six have already been examined.

Heard.

The petitioner is behind the bars since 31.05.2016. The complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution. The petitioner is not involved in any other FIR.

Keeping in view the above and without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of the trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

However, anything noticed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.10.2016

atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)

JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable : Yes No