

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

CRM-M-17477-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.05.2017.

Mohd. Munazir

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

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

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG Punjab
assisted by ASI Manjit Singh.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

CRM No. 17611 of 2017

It is submitted that while drafting the bail application
inadvertently in the head note of the petition, Section 379 IPC has been
reflected instead of Section 379-B IPC.

Learned State counsel states that he has no objection
if the CRM is allowed.

In view of above, the CRM is allowed. Amended
Head Note and Prayer are taken on record.

Main case

The present petition has been filed under Section 439
the Cr.P.C seeking regular bail in case FIR No.44 dated 22.03.2017
registered under Sections 392, 379-B and 411 IPC and Section 25 of

Arms Act at Police Station Haibowal, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a young boy of 18 years with clean antecedents. He is not involved in any other FIR. He has been falsely implicated in the present case and two mobile phones have been allegedly shown to be recovered from him in pursuance of the disclosure statement made by him. Co-accused, Arshdeep Singh @ Prince from whom the much higher recovery along with pistol was effected, has been already admitted to bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody since 22.03.2017.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel admits the factum that the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR except the present FIR and the age of the petitioner is also admitted. However, he states that as against two mobile phones asserted by the petitioner, in fact, seven mobile phones and one datar were recovered from the petitioner.

Heard.

Considering the fact that no further recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, the investigation is complete, this Court is inclined to accept the prayer, so, without commenting on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/duty Magistrate concerned.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as
an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.05.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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