

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

(Sr. No. 208)

CRM-M No. 4903 of 2022

Date of decision : 06.04.2022

Bilal alias Tony

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present : Mr. Bhisham Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail in FIR No.431 dated 06.06.2021 registered under Sections 379-A IPC (Sections 201 and 34 IPC added later on) at Police Station Quilla Panipat, district Panipat.

The petitioner and his co-accused Mannawar are being prosecuted for having snatched the complainant's mobile phone.

Seeking regular bail, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; he is in custody since 22.06.2021; investigation in this case is complete; the complainant has already been examined before the Trial Court; while appearing before the Trial Court the complainant has specifically stated that it was not the petitioner who had snatched his mobile phone; similarly placed co-accused Mannawar, who had approached this Court through CRM-M No.47330 of 2021 – Mannawar Vs. State of Haryana has been

granted regular bail on 27.01.2022 and that the petitioner's trial will take a long time to conclude.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner faces another similar criminal case and if released on bail he may indulge in similar offences.

The petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2021; the investigation in this case is complete; the complainant already stands examined before the Trial Court; while appearing before the Trial Court the complainant has specifically stated that it was not the petitioner who snatched his mobile phone; similarly placed co-accused Mannawar has been granted regular bail by this Court and that the petitioner's trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

In view of the above, the present case is considered to be a fit one in which the petitioner be directed to be released on regular bail. Resultantly, subject to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate, Panipat, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail.

It is clarified that the above observations have been made only for the limited purpose of deciding the present regular bail application and the same would not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.04.2022*sunil yadav***(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No