

235

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-6560-2024
Date of decision : 26.02.2024**

Jashanpreet Singh Alias Jashan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJAPresent : Mr. J.S. Khiva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, DAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA.J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 008 dated 05.01.2024 registered under Section 379-B of IPC at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa, wherein the petitioner has been implicated against the allegations of having snatched the purse having mobile phone make VIVO from the complainant.

2. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that the petitioner is in custody for period which is less than 02 months.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

4. As per the information provided by learned State counsel, the investigation stands concluded with the preparation of the challan and the same is going to be filed before Illaqa/Magistrate shortly. The petitioner is young boy aged about 21 years and he is not involved in any other criminal case of similar nature.

5. Considering the fact that the investigation in the present case, already stands concluded with the preparing of the challan which is going to be filed very soon by the State. Thus, the trial is likely to take some time, besides it, the petitioner is already behind the bars for the last almost 02 months, I do not find any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

6. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

26.02.2024
monika

Whether speaking/reasoned ? Yes/No
Whether Reportable ? Yes/No