

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

229

**2023:PHHC:120223**

**CRM-M-44129-2023**

Date of decision: September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Amandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Gitesh Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.132 dated 07.09.2022 under Sections 379B, 411, 34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Dugri, Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR in question was registered against unknown persons, who allegedly snatched the mobile phone of the complainant. Learned counsel submits that though the number of the motorcycle, on which the alleged assailants were riding, had been given in the FIR in question, however, it was a matter of record that the said motorcycle was not in the name of the petitioner. He submits that after his arrest on 07.09.2022, challan has been presented and prosecution evidence is underway. However, there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future as six prosecution witnesses out of the nine cited, still remain to be examined.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has not disputed that the FIR in question was registered against unknown persons as well as the motorcycle, on which the alleged assailants were riding at the time of the occurrence in question, was not in the name of the petitioner. However, he submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in two other cases of snatching. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not however, disputed that the petitioner is on bail in both the other cases, which stand registered against him.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.
5. The petitioner has been in custody since 07.09.2022 and the trial will take considerable time to conclude. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove and the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.
6. The instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
7. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023

*Puneet*

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether reportable : No