

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

**CRM-M No. 45005 of 2019
Date of Decision:-29.10.2019**

Shyam @ Mona

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present:- Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ J.(Oral)

Petitioner-Shyam @ Mona has filed the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No. 303 dated 22.6.2019, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 365, 379-B, 506 IPC and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Faridabad Kotwali, District Faridabad. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 05.7.2019.

Broadly the allegations made in the FIR were regarding giving beatings to the complainant by the accused persons. It was further alleged that accused Shanki snatched Vivo A-7 mobile phone of the complainant, whereas Chandan snatched his gold chain and the other accused, namely, Umesh Pandit and Bidhuri snatched Rs.14,000/- from his pocket.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the investigation in the case is complete and the challan stands filed. He submits that the case of the petitioner is similar to co-accused, namely, Rajesh and Chandan, who have been granted the concession of regular bail by the trial Court vide orders dated 15.10.2019 and 26.9.2019 respectively. He submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, who is assisted by ASI Vinod Kumar opposed the prayer, however, he does not dispute this fact that the investigation of the case is complete and the co-accused Rajesh and Chandan have been extended the concession of bail by the trial Court. He further submits that the case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, who have been released on bail by the trial Court.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time and keeping in view the custodial period of the petitioner, his further custody may not be justified. Therefore, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, Faridabad.

The petition is allowed.

October 29, 2019
Vijay Asija

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No