

222

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

**CRM-M-10318-2022
Date of Decision: 30.03.2022**

Parveen Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Vijay Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.300, dated 27.07.2021 under Sections 34 & 379-A of the IPC, 1860 and Sections 25, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 (later on Sections 392 & 397 of the IPC were added and Sections 25, 54 & 59 Arms Act were deleted), registered at Police Station Baroda, District Sonapat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody from 08.08.2021 and the investigation of the present has already been completed but no witness has been examined till date. He further submitted that the petitioner was also involved in another FIR pertaining to Section 379 of the IPC in which he has been convicted. He also submitted that since the investigation of the present case has been completed and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, therefore, he may be considered for the grant of bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that the petitioner was involved in another FIR under Section 379 of the IPC and he stands convicted in that case and so far as the present case is concerned, he along with other co-accused had snatched one motorcycle and an amount of Rs.160/- on gun point. However, later on it was found that the pistol was a toy pistol. He further submitted that there is strong apprehension that in case the petitioner is released on bail then he may threaten the complainant, who is the material witness in the present case and considering the antecedents of the petitioner, he is not entitled for the grant of regular bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

No witness has been examined till date, although the petitioner is in custody from 08.08.2021 but considering the antecedents of the petitioner as aforesaid, the petitioner is not entitled for the grant of regular bail, consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

30.03.2022

Bhumika

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE**

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