

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

205

CRM-M-31268-2017

Date of Decision: 08.11.2017.

Iqbal Mohammad @ Iqbalu

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Bhavna Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Ramendra Jain, J.(Oral)

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.177 dated 22.11.2016 registered under Sections 459, 148, 149 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 411, 394 and 307 IPC added lateron), at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar (Rural).

According to the prosecution, the petitioner alongwith his co-accused trespassed the house of the complainant and caused injury with *Datar, Dang* and *Gandasi* and forcibly snatched Rs.6500/-, wrist watch, gold ring and locket from him. He also inflicted injury on the head of the father of the complainant and his mother too and forcibly snatched her gold ear rings weighing six grams and gold bangles.

Learned counsel inter-alia contends that the petitioner is in custody since 27.11.2016. The complainant and the material witnesses have

been examined and perhaps have turned hostile. Conclusion of the trial shall take sufficient long time and no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any further in jail.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, submitting that the petitioner would scuttle the trial being resident of Meerut (U.P.), which is at a far away place from the place of occurrence.

Considering over all facts and circumstances, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted regular bail, during the trial, subject to his furnishing bail bond and surety bonds of two local sureties with the proof of immovable property and in view of the fact that the petitioner is resident of Uttar Pradesh, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

08.11.2017
jitender sharma

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No