



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

214

**CRM-M No.29059 of 2024
Date of decision: 23.09.2024**

RAVI AND ANOTHER

.... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Sumeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.36 dated 21.02.2024 registered under Sections 392, 397 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa on the basis of a written complaint filed by the complainant-Chandan Kumar Sahni alleging therein that on the night of 20.02.2024, he was going towards Kuber Agro on his motorcycle bearing registration No. HR 24 Y 6593 marka HF Deluxe for purchasing some grocery when on the way, he was intercepted by two youths who were standing on the canal bridge with a Platina motorbike. They were having muffled faces. After stopping the motorcycle of the complainant, they removed the keys and by pointing a pistol, they made him part with a sum of ₹4500/- and his Samsung mobile phone and after taking the same, they fled from the spot. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioners were apprehended and were joined into the investigation. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement

**CRM-M No.29059 of 2024****-2-**

in the subject crime and got recovered the snatched mobile phone and a weapon which was carried by them at the time of committing the subject offences. Investigation has since been completed.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. They were not named in the FIR. The complainant had sworn an affidavit in their favour. The assailants were muffled faces. There were no chances of the complainant identifying them. A false recovery has been planted upon them. Trial is like to take time. Their custodial interrogation is not required since the investigation stands completed. No useful purpose would be served by keeping them in custody. Therefore, it is urged that they deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

3. Learned State counsel has argued in terms of the status report filed on behalf of respondent-State that there are serious allegations against the petitioners. Petitioner No.2-Vijay Kumar is not having clean antecedents since he was involved in another case bearing FIR No.175 dated 03.11. 2012 registered at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa. It is submitted that the recovery of mobile phone was effected from the petitioners and they were duly identified by the complainant during investigation. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

5. The petitioners along with the co-accused are alleged to have robbed the complainant of a sum of Rs.4500/- and one Samsung mobile phone on 20.02.2024. Investigation has since been completed. Trial is like to take time. There is no basis for the contention that the petitioners may abscond or



CRM-M No.29059 of 2024

-3-

intimidate with the witnesses. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioners, the fact that the trial is likely to take time and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioners deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Hence, the petition is allowed and petitioners are ordered to be admitted to bail subject to their furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Pending application, if any, automatically stands disposed of.

23.09.2024.
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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