



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M No.22960 of 2024
Date of Decision: 13.05.2024

BALWINDER SINGH @ GAURAV**.....Petitioner****Vs****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Aman Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

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.51 dated 29.01.2024 registered under Section 379-B IPC (Section 411 IPC added later on) at Police Station City Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was apprehended with the allegations of having snatched mobile phone of the complainant with the help of his other accomplices.

3. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel as well as by learned counsel for the complainant while submitting that such kinds of incidents are rising in the society and, thus he petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail, especially when his custody is only 03 months.



4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
5. In the present case, the petitioner is behind the bars for more than 3 months and the investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan. Besides this, the petitioner is first offender, who is 20 years of age; not involved in any other case of similar nature and the conclusion of trial may take some time.
6. Considering the aforesaid facts, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.
7. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
8. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

May 13, 2024
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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