

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

241

CRM-M-35494-2019

DATE OF DECISION: 27.11.2019

RAVI SABBARWAL

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Gurwinder Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Chetan Kapoor, Advocate for the complainant.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.128 dated 16.04.2019, under Sections 379, 406, 420 & 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Madhuban, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR are that the petitioner along with the complainant were setting up industrial unit for manufacturing submersible pumps and it is alleged that on the assurances of the petitioner that the business will pick up, the complainant had invested large sum of money. He further contends that the petitioner is alleged to have been arrested in another case and the factory had been closed down. It was later on 09.04.2019, the complainant had been informed telephonically by a known person that his machinery and material has been stolen. It is also alleged that the machinery has been concealed with Sharma Agro. He also contends that the petitioner and the complainant were in the process

of setting up the unit in the year 2017 and the investment had been made by the complainant in the year 2017-18. The business did not take off. The FIR is outcome of a monetary dispute between the parties. The petitioner has no concern with Sharma Agro wherein the machinery was alleged to have been concealed. The petitioner is in custody for over 5 months and 20 days since his arrest on 05.06.2019.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from SI Sukhbir Singh, states that 1 out of 13 prosecution witnesses has been examined.

Heard.

In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when petitioner is in custody for over 5 months and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

27.11.2019.

SwarnjitS

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