

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

1. CRM-M-32733-2022

RaviPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
.....Respondent

2. CRM-M-42371-2022
Date of decision:-25.05.2023

SheruPetitioner

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. J.S. Saneta, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-32733-2022) and

Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-42371-2022).

Mr. Samarth Sagar, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. These petitions under Section 439 Cr.P.C. are filed seeking regular bail in FIR No.274 dated 28.12.2020 under Sections 379-B of Indian Penal Code (Sections 201 and 34 of Indian Penal Code added later on) and Sections 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Line Paar, Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar.

2. The case as set up by the prosecution is that on 25.12.2020,

2023:PHHC:075922

unidentified persons after inflicting injuries to Deepak-complainant snatched a bag containing cash, mobile phones and sim card. On arrest of Sheru (petitioner in CRM-M-42371-2022) and Ravi (petitioner in CRM-M-32733-2022) on 19.03.2021, a mobile phone and an amount of Rs.15,000/- and Rs.14,000/- was recovered from them.

3.. Earlier two petitions bearing Nos.CRM-M-27329-2021 and CRM-M-38994-2021 filed by petitioner namely Ravi, were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 22.07.2021 and 29.11.2021 respectively.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are in custody since March 2021 and the trial is not progressing at a decent pace; no recovery is to be made from the petitioners; the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution and the petitioners are not involved in any other criminal case.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners and submits that there was recovery of mobile and cash from the petitioners. He relies upon the pleadings of the reply and submits that the petitioners are not involved in any other criminal case.

6. The observations made hereinafter shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Considering that no further recovery is to be made from the petitioners; the petitioners have no criminal antecedents, conclusion of trial is likely to take time and no useful purpose would be served by depriving their personal liberty, the petitioners are granted bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/

Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. The petitions are allowed.
9. Since the main cases have been allowed, the pending application(s), if any is rendered infructuous.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

25.05.2023
shweta

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