

2024:PHHC:108572



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

222

**CRM-M No.30532 of 2024
Date of Decision: 22.08.2024**

Satnam Singh @ Sonu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition has been made by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.0014 dated 28.01.2024 initially registered under Section 379B of IPC at Police Station Ghuman, District Batala, on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Kashmir Kaur alleging therein that on 27.01.2024 at about 1:30 PM, she was sitting on a folding bed in front of gate of her house when two youths with muffled faces came on a motorbike. One of them was having a datar in his hand. They put the datar on her head and after snatching gold earring worn in her left ear forcibly, they tried to snatch other earring as well. She raised rescue alarm and thereafter both of them fled away. She submitted that the incident had also been seen by

2024:PHHC:108572



her sons. They had been making inquiries at their own level and had come to know that the present petitioner along with the co-accused Gurbinder Singh were the persons who had snatched her earring. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and the co-accused were arrested on the same day. They got recovered two motorcycles which were also found to be stolen. Offences under Sections 379-B (2), 379, 411, 201 and 34 of IPC were also added. The investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented in the Court. The petitioner had moved application for grant of regular bail which had been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide order dated 08.04.2024.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No recovery has been effected from him. He is in custody since 28.01.2024. The trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

3. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned State counsel has argued that apart from the present case, the petitioner is involved in two more cases of similar nature and is facing trial in the same. There are chances of his committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. Hence, it is argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned

2024:PHHC:108572



State counsel at considerable length and have gone through the record.

5. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have snatched earring of the complainant as on 27.01.2024. He along with the co-accused is also alleged to have committed theft of two motorbikes. He is in custody for a period of six and half months. The trial is likely to take time. Pendency of other criminal cases against him is not a ground to deny benefit of bail to him. In view of the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of the subject offences, the fact that the trial is likely to take time and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I allow this petition. Hence, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

22.08.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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