

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

DECIDED ON: 24th MARCH, 2021

1. CRM-M-27001 of 2020

Vikram @ Vicky

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....RESPONDENT

2. CRM-M-44247 of 2020

Vikram @ Vicky

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Vishwajeet, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, DAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

These are two petitions i.e. CRM-M-27001 of 2020 and CRM-M-44247-2020 for grant of regular bail in case of FIR No. 113 dated 5.5.2020 under Section 379-A IPC, 1860 (Section 379-B, 411 and 120-B IPC 1860 were added later), registered at Police Station Kalayat District Kaithal, and FIR No. 49 dated 15.3.2020, under Section 379-A IPC 1860 (Section 411 IPC 1860 was added later) registered at Police Station Garhi District Jind.

The FIRs were at the behest of complainants who had suffered snatching incident. During investigation on the disclosure statement of Karampal and Anil, the name of the petitioner surfaced. It was stated that the petitioner who is engaged in the business of jewellery used to purchase the snatched ornaments.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and only recovery was of ₹3000/- and ₹500/- in each case was made. He argues that the story of recovery put forth is improbable. The petitioner is engaged in business and bound to have the small amount available with him. It is further argued that investigation is complete and no recovery is to be made.

Reply dated 22.3.2021 filed in Court is taken on record.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Gurdev Singh vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of bail. Argument is that petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in nine cases.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has been grant bail in some of the cases.

The petitioner was not named in the FIR. His nomination is on the basis of disclosure statement. It would not be appropriate at this stage to comment upon the recovery made from the petitioner. *Albeit*, challan is presented, conclusion of trial is likely to take time and in the facts and circumstances of the case, it would not be appropriate to deprive the personal liberty of the petitioner. The petitioner is granted regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

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

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

24th MARCH, 2021

reema

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	Yes
<i>Whether reportable</i>	Yes