

215

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

1) CRM-M No.44118 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.02.2017

Kundan Lal @ Kundi

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

2) CRM-M No.44769 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.02.2017

Amarjit kaur

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M No.44118 of 2016).

Mr. Gulzar mohammad, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M No.44769 of 2016).

Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Tejinder Singh Dhindsa, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of CRM-M No.44118 of 2016

(Kundan Lal @ Kundi Vs. State of Punjab) and CRM-M No.44769

CRM-M No.44118 of 2016

of 2016 (Amarjit Kaur Vs. State of Punjab) as prayer made in both these petitions is for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.212 dated 04.10.2016, under Sections 379-B, 323, 34, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Mohinder Singh. Complainant has asserted that deal with regard to purchase of a house was facilitated by Amarjit Kaur (petitioner herein in CRM-M No.44769 of 2016). Complainant was proceeding towards Nakodar for execution of sale deed with Rs.3 lacs in cash. On the way, he was accosted by three unidentified persons, who were travelling in a small commercial vehicle. Allegations are that a sum of Rs. 3 lacs and 3 mobile phones were snatched from the complainant and thereafter the assailants escaped from the spot. Finger of suspicion was pointed on Amarjit Kaur by stating that she was aware that complainant had withdrawn money for the execution of sale deed. Kundan Lal @ Kundi (petitioner in CRM-M No. 44118 of 2016) has been implicated on the basis of identification parade held in which the complainant had allegedly identified him.

The petitioner(s) were arrested on 10.10.2016. Investigation having been completed, challan has been presented. Charges are yet to be framed.

CRM-M No.44118 of 2016

In the totality of circumstances and keeping in view the fact that trial is still at the very initial stage, petitioner(s) are held entitled to the concession of bail.

Both the petitions are allowed.

Petitioner(s) be enlarged on bail subject to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

[TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA]
JUDGE

08.02.2017
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No