

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

**CRM-M No. 48400 of 2019
Date of Decision:-20.11.2019**

Satnam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present:- Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ J.(Oral)

Petitioner-Satnam Singh has filed the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No. 101 dated 21.8.2019, under Section 382 IPC, registered at Police Station Nurpur Bedi, District Rupnagar. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 21.8.2019.

As per FIR, the allegations against the petitioner are that on 20.8.2019 at about 11.30 p.m., the petitioner along with Happy Singh snatched Rs.9000/- and one cell phone from complainant Harnam Singh s/o Gulzar Singh when he was going from Kahanpur Khuhi towards Ropar side in his tipper.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the offences are triable by Magistrate and the petitioner is in custody since the day of

arrest on 21.8.2019. According to him the investigation of the case is complete and the challan has already been filed before the trial Court. He submits that further detention of the petitioner may not be necessary as the trial is likely to take some time. He has relied upon the order dated 24.10.2019 passed by this Court in CRM-M-44621-2019 (Annexure P-3), whereby similarly placed co-accused Happy Singh has been granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel, who is assisted by ASI Satnam opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the offence is serious in nature. However, it is not disputed that after completion of investigation, the challan stands filed before the trial Court and the co-accused of the petitioner has been extended the concession of regular bail.

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/Duty Magistrate, Ropar.

The petition is allowed.

November 20, 2019
Vijay Asija

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No