

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

234

CRM-M-32471-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.09.2022

SAHIL @ S.K.

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Vikas Gulia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.28 dated 28.06.2021, registered under Section 379-A IPC and Section 395 IPC (added later on), at Police Station GRP Rohtak, District GRP Ambala City.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that the petitioner was initially arrested in FIR No.288 dated 26.06.2021, under Sections 379-B, 395 and 397 IPC and Section 201 IPC (added later on), at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonipat; that after his arrest in the said FIR, the petitioner, on his own disclosure statement, has been indicted in the present case; that the alleged recovery of Rs.600/- was effected from the petitioner and that the petitioner has been in custody since 08.07.2021.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular

bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner along with his accomplice, had snatched mobile phone and a purse containing Rs8,150/- from the complainant and that there are serious and direct allegations against the petitioner. He further submits that post framing of the charges, the prosecution evidence is yet to commence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 08.07.2021. On the basis of his own disclosure statement, the petitioner has been indicted in the present case. In FIR No.288 dated 26.06.2021, the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.04.2022. Nothing further is to be recovered from the petitioner. Prosecution evidence is yet to commence. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

14.09.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*