

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

Date of decision : April 11, 2019

1. CRM-M No.9498 of 2019

Sohanvir Singh vs State of Haryana

2. CRM-M No.14380 of 2018

Kamruddin vs State of Haryana

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No.9498 of 2019.

Mr. SS Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No.14380 of 2018.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, AAG Haryana

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the aforesaid petitions as they arise from the same FIR.

The petitioners seek grant of regular bail in case FIR No.514, dated 21.8.2018, registered under Sections 395, 397, 120G, 206 of the IPC and Sections 25/54 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari.

As per the allegations, the complainant along with another person was travelling from Delhi to Ahmadabad in a car while carrying a sum of ₹4.5 crores in cash and on the way the petitioners along with their co-accused waylaid them, snatched their car and the money and escaped.

Counsel for the petitioners have argued that petitioner-

Sohanvir Singh has been in custody for almost six months, while petitioner-Kamruddin has been in custody for about five months and except for the disclosure statement of the main accused (Salman from whom the bulk of money was recovered), there is no other evidence against the petitioners.

Learned AAG Haryana, on instructions from ASI Suresh Kumar, states that a sum of ₹2 lakhs was recovered from petitioner-Sohanvir Singh and a sum of ₹ 1 lakh was recovered from petitioner-Kamruddin, and has accepted the fact that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence against the petitioners.

Custody certificates have been filed, as per which petitioner-Sohanvir Singh has been in custody for 5 months and 29 days and petitioner-Kamrudeen has been in custody for 4 months and 25 days and there is no other case pending against them.

In these circumstances, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and keeping in view the period of custody already suffered by the petitioners, I do not deem it appropriate to deny the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Petitions stands disposed of.

Since the main cases have been decided, the pending C.Ms, if any, also stand disposed of.

April 11, 2019
`kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No