

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

1. CRM-M-27368-2021

Date of Decision: 14th October, 2021

Munish Kumar @ Maninder

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-23838-2021 (O&M)

Ravina Agnihotri

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate and
Mr. A.K. Spehia, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through
video conference.

These two petitions under Section 439 Cr.P.C. are filed for
regular bail in FIR No. 189 dated 29.12.2020, under Sections 379-B(2),
482, 212, 216-A, 120-B IPC, registered Police Station Maqsudan, District
Jalandhar Rural.

The brief facts are that that FIR was registered at the instance of Smakash Nakra. As per the allegations on 28th December, 2020, he met Raveena Agnihotri on Instagram. In order to meet her he went to the flats near Jalandhar Kunj in his car bearing registration No. PB08-CR-9484. There he saw a girl and boy standing. The girl introduced her accomplice as her brother. In the meantime, two boys on activa and two on motorcycle came, they gave beatings to the complainant snatched the keys of the car, silver bracelet and two I-phones. While fleeing, they took away the car.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in custody since third week of January, 2021, investigation is complete and no recovery is to be made. He further submits that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution during the trial.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail. She submits that recoveries were made from the petitioners. A plan was executed by the accused for depriving the complainant of his valuables. Some of the accused are yet to be arrested. She on instructions from ASI Major Singh is not in a position to dispute that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution.

The investigation in the case is complete, no recovery is to be made. Considering the age of the petitioners and the contention that complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners in custody. Petitioners are granted regular bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petitions are allowed.

It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be

Since the main case is disposed of, pending application renders infructuous, if any.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

14th October, 2021
Parveen Sharma

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