



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-46732-2024
Date of decision: November 12th, 2024

Jasmail Singh
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.170 dated 02.08.2024 under Sections 379-B, 341, 34 of the IPC registered at Police Station City Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the occurrence in question took place on 02.04.2024, however, the petitioner was arrested only on 02.08.2024. It has been further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case at hand for allegedly snatching the mobile handset of the complainant along with the co-accused. Learned counsel submits that since the investigation in the present case is complete and challan also stands presented, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose as there is no possibility of the trial concluding in the near future.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by submitting



CRM-M-46732-2024 **-2-**

that the petitioner is a habitual offender and it is not the first time that he has committed offences of snatching. It has been further submitted that the petitioner was on bail in the other criminal cases which stood registered against him and it was during that period that he yet again indulged in similar crime. Learned State counsel submits that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail, more so when the material witnesses have also not been examined.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. *Prima facie*, the petitioner indeed comes across as a habitual offender. As per instructions received by the learned State counsel, the petitioner is involved in as many as five other cases of similar nature.

6. In the facts and circumstances, no ground is made out to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner, more so when the complainant has not yet been examined.

7. The instant petition stands dismissed.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

November 12th, 2024 **(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**
Puneet **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No