

212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-47006-2021

Date of decision: 17.11.2021

Krishan @ Kishu

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Maninder Singh Bajwa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral).

[1] This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 211, dated 16th September, 2020, under Sections 379-B (2) IPC (Sections 120-B, 324, 325, 201 and 411 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran.

[2] The brief facts of the case are that as per allegations money was snatched from the complainant when he was going back home after withdrawing the amount from the bank. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he was accomplice of the co-accused Manjeet Singh to whom information of withdrawal of money was passed by the co-accused bank employees.

[3] Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since September, 2020. Investigation is complete, challan

stands presented. The name of the petitioners surfaced in a disclosure statement. He further submits that the complainant while appearing as a witness has not supported the case of the prosecution. Co-accused were granted bail by this Court.

[4] Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail. She submits that petitioner is involved in one more case but she is not in a position to dispute the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

[5] Mere involvement of petitioner in other case would not be in itself a ground to deprive the petitioner of his personal liberty. Considering the facts that no recovery was made from the petitioner, his name surfaced in the disclosure statement and co-accused were granted bail, the petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

[6] The petition is allowed.

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

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

17th November, 2021

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No