

241

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

**CRM-M-30574-2022
Date of Decision: 24.08.2022**

Paras Petitioner
Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CRM-M-30617-2022

Sumit Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner in both cases.

Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

Both the petitions have been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the petitioners and are being taken up together for final disposal with the consent of the learned counsel for the petitioners, since both the petitions arise out of the same FIR bearing FIR No.918 dated 25.09.2021, under Sections 379-B, 201 & 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Karnal, District Karnal.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners in both the cases that both the petitioners are in custody since 15.10.2021

which is almost ten months. He further submitted that the investigation of the case has been completed and thereafter, the complainant has also been examined. He also submitted that it is a case where the allegations against the petitioners were that they had come on motorcycle and had snatched a bag containing Rs.10,000/- and some documents i.e. Adhaar Card, Driving Licence and one mobile phone. He further submitted that both the petitioners are falsely implicated in the present case and no recovery is to be effected from them. He also submitted that when the complainant had deposed before the learned trial Court at the time of trial, he did not support the prosecution version and while deposing as PW-2, rather he had stated that the present petitioners are not those persons, who had snatched the articles from him. He further submitted that thereafter the complainant has declared hostile. He also submitted that be that as it may, the trial of the case may take long time, and therefore, the petitioners may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that it is correct that both the petitioners are in custody since 15.10.2021 and at the time of trial, the complainant did not support the prosecution version and was declared hostile.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the aforesaid position, both the petitioners deserve the concession of regular bail. Consequently, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate

concerned, if not required in any other case.

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.

24.08.2022
Bhumika

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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