

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

CRM-M-17378-2022

Date of decision : 01.06.2022

Rippy

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No.05 dated 05.01.2022 under Sections 380 and 454 Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal, who is in custody since her arrest on 12.03.2022.

The contents of the FIR as noticed by the learned Sessions Judge, Kaithal in his order dated 18.04.2022 are as under:-

“Vishal s/o Ajmer has alleged that: on 3.1.2022, he and his father Ajmer s/o Karam Chand had come at SBI Main Branch-Kaithal from their house at village: Sanghan, while taking Rs.97,000/- for depositing in Bank. When at about 11:00 a.m. they reached at ATM of SBI Bank-Kaithal and counted money by filling deposit voucher and while he (complainant) was in process of depositing amount, then zip of his bag was open and amount of Rs.97,000/- was not lying in bag. Some unknown thief has committed theft of money. Till today, he has been enquiring about his money, at his own level and no clue could be found. On these allegations; case u/ss 380,454 IPC was registered.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that except for the

present case, petitioner is not involved in any other case much less of similar nature. According to him, investigation of the case is complete and challan also stands filed on 07.04.2022, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be necessary. He prays for bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Kuldeep Singh opposed the prayer, however, it is not disputed by him that petitioner is not involved in any other case. He on instructions further submits that investigation is complete, however, charges are yet to be framed.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, considering the above background, custody of the petitioner and the fact that the offences are triable by Magistrate, this Court is of the opinion that the conclusion of trial is likely to consume considerable time, therefore, further detention of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose, who is presently confined in judicial custody after his arrest on 12.03.2022.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to her furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

01.06.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No