

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

223

CRM-M-15277-2024
Date of decision : 25.04.2024

Sandeep

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present : Mr. Rahul Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

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. 40 dated 22.02.2024 registered under Section 379 of IPC (Sections 201, 411 and 476 were added later on) at Police Station Khol, District Rewari, wherein the petitioner has been implicated of having provided assistance to the co-accused namely Naresh Kumar for the purposes of getting a deal about the sale of stolen trola.

2. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that the involvement of the petitioner was *prima facie* established from the recovery of RC and Insurance of the stolen trola from at the house of the petitioner.

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. In the present case there is no allegation against the petitioner of being involved in theft of trola but the only allegation against him is that he helped the co-accused namely Naresh Kumar and assisted him so as to struck deal about the sale of the said stolen trola.

5. Considering the fact that the investigation in the present case, already stands concluded with the filing of challan and trial is likely to take some time, besides it, the petitioner is already behind the bars for the last almost 2 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

25.04.2024
monika

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