

219

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-1889-2024 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 19.01.2024

Rohit Sharma ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH**

Present: Ms. Sarika Gupta, Advocate for  
Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jashanpreet DAG, Punjab.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.149 dated 23.08.2023 under Sections 379-B, 411 IPC, at Police Station Garshankar, District Hoshiarpur.
2. The allegations in nutshell are that one unknown person who was riding a Pulsar motor cycle bearing number PB-07-BL-5271 snatched purse from Manpreet Kaur daughter of the complainant Sukhdarshan Singh and then he fled away from there. The petitioner was arrested in this case on 23.08.2023 and concerned articles were recovered from his possession.
3. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner was falsely nominated as accused in the present case and is in custody for the last about 5 months and that now matter stands compromised between the parties and a petition for quashing of FIR on the basis of

compromise bearing number CRM-M-2000-2024 is pending in this Court for 20.03.2024 wherein directions are already given for recording of the statement of the parties. So, prayer is made that the petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. The State counsel on instructions from ASI Ravish Kumar while opposing the present petition inter alia submits that there is enough evidence on the record to establish the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence of snatching which took place on 23.08.2023. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that FIR in this case was registered against one unknown person who committed aforesaid snatching from Manpreet Kaur daughter of the complainant.

5. Ms. Amrinder Kaur, Advocate appearing on behalf of the complainant has not disputed the fact regarding the compromise which has been effected between the parties and is having no objection if the petitioner is released on bail.

6. In view of the above, it appears that compromise has been effected between the petitioner and the complainant party. In the given circumstances, no purpose is going to be served by detaining the petitioner in custody for any longer period.

7. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**19.01.2024**

*Yogesh*

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-  
Whether reportable:-**

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**Yes/No  
Yes/No**