



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

214

**CRM-M No.45719 of 2024
Date of Decision: 19.09.2024**

Maninder Singh @ Mani

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Pushp Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein is making prayer for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.81 dated 22.06.2024 initially registered under Section 379B of IPC with offence under Section 411 read with Section 34 of IPC having added later on, at Police Station City 1 Mansa, District Mansa, on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Sanjay on 22.06.2024 alleging therein that on 21.06.2024 at about 9 PM, he was standing near shed of grain market at Mansa when three youths riding on a motorbike bearing registration No.PB 31 X-8021 came towards him and by forcibly snatching the mobile phone which he was carrying in his hand, they escaped. The complainant identified those youths as Harpreet Singh, the present petitioner-Maninder Singh and Jaspreet Singh as they were already known to him. He prayed for taking

2024:PHHC:124396



action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigating proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and co-accused were apprehended on 22.06.2024. The snatched mobile phone and the motorcycle used by them at the time of occurrence was recovered from their possession. Investigation has since been completed.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Recovery of snatched mobile phone has not been effected from him. Infact, a minor dispute had taken place between the complainant and the co-accused as well as himself and to take revenge, the complainant got registered the FIR of this case. The registration number of the vehicle which was allegedly used by the snatchers at the time of occurrence and as disclosed by the complainant had been changed subsequently in his supplementary statement which made his version doubtful. Investigation has since been completed. Challan has been filed. The petitioner has clean antecedents. Custodial interrogation of petitioner is no more required. No purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Trial is likely to take time. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel who has advance notice of the petition and who is ready to argue the matter, has stressed that keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel at considerable length and have gone through the record.

2024:PHHC:124396



5. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have snatched the mobile phone belonging to the complainant from him on 21.06.2024. He is in custody since 22.06.2024. Challan stands presented in the Court. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, in the opinion of this Court, the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, 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.

6. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.09.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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