

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

CRM-M-32996-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 04.08.2022

Shubham Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Yashdeep Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana. .

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 190 dated 02.08.2021, registered under Section 379-B IPC read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station HSIIDC Barhi, District Sonapat. Challan was filed under Section 379-B IPC read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, but the charges were framed under Sections 379-B, 392, 397, 411 IPC read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act. The earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 07.02.2022 passed by this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; that co-accused Deepak @ Deepu and Sagar @ Katwa, were arrested in another FIR, who in their disclosure statements admitted

their involvement in the present case along with the petitioner; that the petitioner has been in custody since 12.09.2021 and that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. He also points out that till date, no prosecution witness has been examined.

Learned State counsel contends that there are specific allegations against the petitioner that he along with the co-accused have snatched the motorcycle, mobile and some amount from the complainant on the pistol point and the mobile as well as Rs. 500/- have been recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that if the petitioner is released on regular bail, he may indulge himself in more such type of cases.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As noticed above, there are serious allegations against the petition that he along with co-accused persons have snatched the valuables from the complainant. The mobile phone and Rs. 500/- have been recovered from the petitioner, in case, he is enlarged on bail, every effort will be made by him to either tamper with the evidence or win over the witnesses.

In view of the above, I do not find any ground to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

The petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

04.08.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No