



CRM-M-16716-2024 and another connected matter

-1-

217+219 (2 cases)

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

Date of Decision:- 08.11.2024

(1)

CRM-M-16716-2024

Raj Kumar @ Rohit

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-25785-2024

Mangi Lal @ Mang Ram @ Sahil

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Ms. Shalini Atri, Advocate (through V.C.)
for petitioner in CRM-M-16716-2024.

Mr. L.S.Sandhu, Advocate
for petitioner in CRM-M-25785-2024.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. The petitioner(s) – Raj Kumar @ Rohit and Mangi Lal @ Mang Ram @ Sahil have filed separate petitions for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 565 dated 09.10.2023, under Section 120-B, 395 of IPC, 1860 and

**CRM-M-16716-2024 and another connected matter**

-2-

Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 397 of IPC was added later on), registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa. These petitions have arisen out of same FIR, therefore, both petitions are taken up together for disposal.

2. Facts of the case are that Ravi Kumar complainant gave his statement that on 08.10.2023 at about 5:00 PM, he was going on motorcycle TVS Sport to his in-laws house at village Keharwala. He reached village Dudiyanwali at about 11:00 PM, then he noticed that some persons were following him on motorcycle. His motorcycle developed some mechanical defect near village Dudiyanwali stop. Said motorcyclist stopped in front of his motorcycle and told him to handover everything. The boy who was already standing at bus stand Dudiyanwali with muffled face was armed with country made pistol, other boy who was on motorcycle was also armed with gun. Said 6-7 persons snatched his bag containing 5 kg ghee, cash of Rs.5,500/-, pair of clothes, mobile phone and his motorcycle TVS colour black and fled away from there. He informed the police. After some time police also reached on the spot.

During investigation, CCTV footage of cameras was checked. Father-in-law of the complainant namely Madan Soni was joined in the investigation. Names of Satbir and Jitender @ Narender cropped up during investigation. They were arrested on 11.10.2023. Later on co-accused Radhey Shyam was also arrested from whose possession motorcycle TVS Sport, mobile phone were recovered. Present petitioners were also named by Radhey Shyam in his disclosure statement.

**CRM-M-16716-2024 and another connected matter**

-3-

3. Learned counsel for petitioner(s) in both cases argued that both petitioners were arrested on 21.12.2023 and since then they are in judicial custody. Allegations levelled against them are false. They are falsely implicated in this case subsequently. Other co-accused namely Vishanu @ Bishnu has been granted regular bail in CRM-M-16891-2024 vide order dated 15.04.2024 (Annexure P-7). At present, statement of complainant Ravi Kumar has been recorded who did not identify the accused facing trial in this case. Present petitioners are ready to abide by the terms of bail order. Therefore, their regular bail petitions may be allowed.

4. Learned counsel representing State opposed the bail petitions. It is confirmed that after completion of investigation challan has been presented on 29.01.2024. After framing of chargesheet, case is pending for prosecution evidence. It is pointed out that aforesaid petitioners are involved in other FIRs which are detailed in the status report. Allegations levelled against the petitioners are serious. Therefore, they are not entitled to be released on bail.

6. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. Names of present petitioners came into light during investigation. As per the prosecution version, recoveries were also effected from them. At present, case is fixed for prosecution evidence. As referred above, statement of complainant has been recorded as PW-2 who admitted the occurrence but failed to identify the accused facing trial in this case including the present petitioners. Trial in this case may take some time.

7. Considering the aforesaid factual position, without expressing



CRM-M-16716-2024 and another connected matter -4-

my mind on the merits of case, regular bail petitions filed by petitioner(s) –
Raj Kumar @ Rohit and Mangi Lal @ Mang Ram @ Sahil are allowed.
They are ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety
bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Judge concerned.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of
accordingly as well.

08.11.2024
Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No