

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

221

**CRM-M-50328-2019
Date of decision: 08.01.2020**

Pargat Singh @ Doogar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.

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 under Sections 379-B, 411 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

The petition has been opposed by the State in terms of reply filed in Court today.

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. There is no material to show that the mobile phones allegedly recovered from them were snatched mobile phones. There is no direct or circumstantial evidence against the petitioner. 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 habitual 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.

However, learned State counsel has conceded that there is no material to show that the mobile phone allegedly recovered from the petitioner had been snatched from any person and that the petitioner is not involved in any other case of similar nature.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner 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.

08.01.2020

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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