

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

223

CRM-M-9767-2020

Date of decision: 13.03.2020

Sandeep Singh @ Sani @ Sandeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Davinder Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kaundal, DAG, Punjab
for respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present (first) petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.203 dated 09.09.2019 registered under Section 379-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

Learned State counsel has appeared and opposed the petition. However no reply has been filed by the State.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel and gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner and his co-accused were arrested on the basis of alleged secret information regarding snatching of mobile phones by the petitioner and his co-accused from ladies on walk or sitting outside their houses. His similarly placed co-accused Pargat Singh @ Doogar has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 08.01.2020. The petitioner is in custody since 09.09.2019. No useful purpose will be served by his further detention in custody. The petitioner is ready to abide by terms and conditions of regarding appearance in the Court. Therefore, the petitioner may be granted regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has contended that the petitioner is accused of snatching mobile phones and other valuables from ladies and the petitioner does not deserve grant of regular bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, parity of the petitioner with his similarly placed co-accused Pargat Singh @ Doogar who has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 08.01.2020 and also the fact that the trial is likely to take long time but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Bathinda.

However bail is granted to the petitioner subject to the condition that he will not commit any similar offence after his release on bail and in case of commission of similar offence by him, his bail in the present case shall be liable to be cancelled on application to be filed by the prosecution in this regard.

13.03.2020

Rajeev (rvs)

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE**

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