



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

CRM-M-23213-2024
Decided on:-14.05.2024

ShubhamPetitioner..

vs.

State of HaryanaRespondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Ankur Dua, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail pending trial, in case bearing FIR No.588, dated 13.12.2023, registered under Section 379-A read with Section 34 IPC, at Police Station Purani Subzi Mandi, District Rohtak, wherein, the petitioner has been implicated with the allegations of having snatched a mobile phone from the complainant.
2. The prayer made herein has been opposed at the instance of learned State counsel while submitting that the petitioner is involved in one more case of similar nature and thus, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.
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, investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan and the petitioner, who is a young boy of 21 years of age is behind the bars for the last almost 05 months. The trial is likely to take some time.

As regards the involvement of the petitioner in other case, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he was implicated after his arrest in the present case, which is thus, debatable and shall be gone into during trial.

5. Thus, considering the aforesaid facts, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.

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 Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner is found involved in any other case of similar nature in future, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of the present order granting him the concession of regular bail.

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

14.05.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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