

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

CRM-M-37096-2019
Date of decision: 27.09.2019

Rohit @ Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Ms. Sunita Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Khalid, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.518 dated 30.05.2019 under Sections 379-A, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Gurugram, District Gurugram.

The operative part of the order dated 04.09.2019, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, three unknown persons have snatched the mobile phone of the complainant-victim. Thereafter, two co-accused were arrested, however, in the identification parade, the complainant failed to identify any of the co-accused. It is further submitted that the police has already recovered the snatched mobile phone and the motorcycle, used in the commission of offence and the petitioner is nominated on the disclosure statement of one of the co-accused.

Notice of motion for 27.09.2019.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, in

pursuance to the order dated 04.09.2019, has already appeared before the SHO/Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Rishi Pal, has not disputed the factual position and submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 04.09.2019, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

27.09.2019

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No