



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-19043-2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.08.2024

SALEEM SINGH

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.274 dated 21.12.2023 registered under Section 379-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 411, 473, 489, 201 of IPC 1860 and Section 28 of Arms Act 1959 added later on) & (Section 25 of Arms Act deleted later on) registered at Police Station Maqboolpura, Amritsar.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition is that the aforementioned FIR was registered on 21.12.2023 on the statement recorded by the complainant alleging therein that on the said date when he was walking towards his office in Vir Enclave, Amritsar, a young person came from the opposite side on a motorcycle and snatched his mobile phone make Samsung A-32 and a cash amount of Rs.3530/- from his pocket by showing a pistol and ran away from the spot on his motorcycle. He claimed that he can identify the accused person. The complainant prayed for taking action in



the matter. During investigation, a secret information was received that the petitioner Saleem along with his accomplices has committed the subject crime and they have gathered near Ryan International School, Amritsar. Pursuant to the said secret information, the petitioner as well as co-accused were apprehended. During interrogation, the petitioner Saleem suffered disclosure statement that he along with co-accused Ranjit Singh @ Bawa and Navraj Singh had snatched the mobile phone and cash amount from the complainant on pistol point. He also stated that he had sent the said mobile phone to his group member i.e. co-accused Sukhdev Singh through co-accused Pawandeep Singh and Mandeep Singh. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented and presently, the petitioner along with co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 24.12.2023. The investigation has completed. Trial is likely to take time. Co-accused Mandeep Singh, Sukhdev Singh and Pawandeep Singh have been extended benefit of regular bail. The petitioner too deserves to be given concession of regular bail on the ground of parity. He does not have criminal antecedents. There are no chances of his absconding. It is therefore, argued that petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner along with coaccused had snatched the mobile phone and cash amount of money from the complainant. The trial may be expedited. There are chances of petitioner fleeing if extended benefit of bail to him. It is therefore, urged that



petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. Heard.

5. The petitioner along with coaccused is alleged to be involved in snatching the mobile phone and cash amount of Rs.3530/- from the complainant. He is not involved in other case. The coaccused whose case is on similar footing, have been extended benefit of bail by this Court. On the ground of parity, the petitioner too deserves to be released on bail. Even otherwise trial is likely to take time. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. There is no basis for the contention that he may abscond. As such, keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of allegation levelled against him and on the ground of parity but without commenting upon the merit of the case, it is held that the petition deserves to be allowed. The same is accordingly allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Additional Sessions Judge (Duty) concerned.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

21.08.2024
Deepak Patwal

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No