

204

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

**CRM-M No. 29955 of 2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.07.2023**

Vineet Singh @ Sekhon

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of bail pending trial in case FIR No. 06 dated 15.01.2023, under Sections 382/34/201/411 of IPC, 1860 & Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 201/411 of IPC added latter on), registered at Police Station Sadar Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

[2] As per allegations, the petitioner along with two other co-accused entered the medical store being operated by the complainant and snatched Rs.40,000/- from his pocket besides one 0.32 Bore revolver.

[3] Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the investigation in the present case stands concluded with the filing of challan and the petitioner is in custody since 17.01.2023.

[4] Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that two other co-accused, namely, Sandeep Singh & Kuldeep Singh, have

already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide separate orders dated 24.05.2023 (P-4 & P-5) passed in CRM-M No. 13233 of 2023 & CRM-M No. 24474 of 2023 respectively as instituted by them; therefore, the petitioner is also entitled for similar treatment with the aforesaid co-accused.

[5] On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer while submitting that petitioner along with his accomplices forcibly entered into medical store and snatched Rs. 40,000/- from the complainant and thus he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

[6] I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

[7] Considering the fact that the petitioner is behind the bars since 17.01.2023 and investigation already stands concluded as well as the fact that complainant has also been examined, though out of 14 witnesses, 12 are yet to be examined, thus the trial is likely to take some time, I do not deem it appropriate to extend the incarceration of petitioner. Few other factors which also weighed in my mind are the young age of petitioner and he happens to be the first offender, who is stated to be not involved in any other FIR.

[8] In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the present petition, the same is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty

Magistrate concerned.

[9] However, in case the petitioner indulges himself in similar kind of activity, the prosecution as well as complainant shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted in favour of the petitioner in the present case.

July 06, 2023
'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)
`JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>