

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

**CRM-M No. 47510 of 2019
Date of Decision:-14.11.2019**

Monu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present:- Mr. Ajay Sekhawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ J.(Oral)

Petitioner-Monu has filed the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No. 638 dated 15.11.2018, under Section 379-A IPC (later on offence under Section 201 read with Section 34 IPC added), registered at Police Station City Jind, District Jind.

The present case was registered on the complaint moved to police by complainant Bhim Sain son of Ramji Lal, resident of Sant Nagar, Jind on 15.11.2018, wherein he mentioned that on 14.10.2018 he was going

to General Hospital, Jind to meet his relative. When he reached in front of Jaat College, three young boys came on a Motorcycle and snatched his mobile and sped away. His mobile was of MI Company bearing IMEI No.867159036092837, 867159038092835.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 19.11.2018. It is contended that complainant and other person to whom snatched mobile phones were sold by the accused, have testified before the Court and they have not supported the version of the prosecution. According to him, further custody of the petitioner may not be justified as the trial is likely to consume some time. It is contended that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Sukhbir @ Mota has been extended the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 26.8.2019 in CRM-M-33589-2019.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Birbal has opposed the bail application. It is pointed out that there are other cases of similar nature, in which petitioner is involved. However, it is not disputed that co-accused of the petitioner has been granted concession of regular bail by this 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, Jind.

The petition is allowed.

November 14, 2019
Vijay Asija

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No