

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-27038-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 27.11.2020

Vikram Singh @ Vicky

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vishwajeet, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Raghbir Singh.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.122, dated 12.5.2020, Police Station Kalayat, District Kaithal, under Section 379-A IPC (Section 411 IPC added later on).
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Ms. Roshni, wherein it is alleged that on 12.5.2020 when she alongwith Lichmi was going to Diwal Road, then two boys came on a motorcycle and snatched gold

ear-ring from one of her ear and ran away on the motorcycle. It is alleged that the snatched gold ear-ring weighed about ½ a tola.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is nowhere named in the FIR and has subsequently been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused Karanpal @ Kallu to the effect that the snatched gold jewellery was sold to the petitioner who happens to be a jeweller by profession. The learned counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is being nominated on the basis of disclosure statement, it cannot be said that there is any credible evidence against him so as to show his complicity and that as such, he deserves the concession of bail.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner has been specifically nominated as an accused by Karanpal @ Kallu co-accused, no case for grant of bail is made out particularly since he stands involved in four other identical cases. The learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 5 months and that challan already stands presented.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the fact that it is not the petitioner who had snatched the gold ear-ring and that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 5 months and challan already stands presented and that conclusion of trial will take substantial time, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be

released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

November 27, 2020

mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No