

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

CRM-M-1921 of 2022

DECIDED ON: 28th January, 2022

Ajay @ Chhotiya

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Ms. Vanita Jain, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

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

This is a petition filed being aggrieved of order dated 1.4.2021 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Jind rejecting the regular bail in FIR No.339, dated 19.12.2019 under Sections 379-B, 120-B, 201 and 411 of IPC registered at Police Station City Narwana, District Jind.

The FIR was registered at the instance of Vikram Singh against the unknown persons. The allegations were that he was serving at Goyal Service Station, Narwana. On 19.12.2019, he was going to deposit cash in Axis Bank, Narwana. On the way to the bank, three youngsters came on the motorcycle with muffled faces and carrying *dandas*. They hit the motorcycle against the bike of the complainant, gave beating, snatched cash and fled away, there was CCTV footage of the incident available with the police. During the investigation, Amit @ Meet, Amit @ Anta and Ajay @ Chotia (petitioner) were named. The name of the petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement. Earlier application for bail was dismissed as withdrawn on

26.5.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. He was named in a disclosure statement. He submits that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution in his deposition in the trial. He has specifically stated that the petitioner is not the person who snatched the amount and inflicted injuries. He relies upon the fact that co-accused was granted bail.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail and on instructions from ASI Dilbagh, is not disputing the contention raised by learned counsel for petitioner. He fairly submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Without making any comments on the merits of the case, considering that the investigation is complete and the petitioner is in custody since December 2019 and conclusion of trial is likely to take time, bail is granted to the petitioner on furnishing surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

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

28th January, 2022

reema

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes*