

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-28727 of 2022

Date of Decision:22.09.2022

Sonu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, for
Mr. Angar Parmar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439(1)(i) of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.451 dated 22.12.2021, under Sections 392, 411, 120-B, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Central Faridabad, District Faridabad.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody from 04.01.2022 and even as per the allegations the persons who had come to the bank and allegedly committed bank robbery were muffled faces and the petitioner was not identifiable and even the CCTV footage was not clear visible. He submitted that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the investigation of the case has been completed and therefore, the petitioner may be considered for grant of regular bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, learned DAG, Haryana has stated that the petitioner although is in custody from 04.01.2022 and the

investigation of the case has been completed but it is a case where three muffled faces persons entered into the Canara Bank, Sector-15, Faridabad and looted approximately Rs.1,84,000/- at gun point and thereafter they ran away. He submitted that there was a CCTV footage in the near vicinity from where the petitioner can be identified and the motorcycle which was used in the crime was also clearly visible. He further submitted that in view of the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail and particularly in view of the fact that no material witness has been examined as yet but only one official witness has been examined and there is serious apprehension that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may abscond from justice and influence any witness

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Although the petitioner is in custody from 04.01.2022 and the investigation of the case has been completed but considering the gravity and seriousness of the case, wherein as per the learned State counsel in the near vicinity of the bank another CCTV footage was available wherein the petitioner and the motorcycle allegedly used in the commission of offence were visible.

The learned State counsel has also stated that there is a strong apprehension that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may flee from justice. Therefore the argument raised by the learned State counsel thus carry weight and cannot be ignored.

Therefore in view of the aforesaid position, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant the regular bail to the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid position, finding no merit in the petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

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

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

September 22, 2022
dinesh

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No