



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2226-2025
DECIDED ON: 06.11.2025

SANDEEP KUMAR ALIAS DEEPAKPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

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

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Neha Bindal, Advocate, for
Mr. Satbir Singh Gill, Advocate, for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.444, dated 21.06.2024, under Sections 379-A and 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Sirsa, District Sirsa.

2. As per the allegations, on 01.06.2024, when the complainant and his wife were returning from Kali Mata Mandir (temple), an unknown boy allegedly came and snatched the chain worn by the complainant's wife, and thereafter fled in a car, bearing registration No. HR51-A-3444, which was being driven by another person.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no name of any accused has been mentioned in the FIR and petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that, as per investigation, the alleged gold chain was recovered from the co-accused

and not from the petitioner. In fact, even the recovery shown from the co-accused is alleged to have been planted.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that investigation has already been completed, and *challan* was filed on 21.10.2024, whereas petitioner has been in custody since 27.06.2024, i.e. last more than one year and four months. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 04.11.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

As per custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone the sentence period of 01 years 04 months and 08 days inside jail.

6. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that offences of such nature are on the rise in society, causing a sense of insecurity among the public due to frequent occurrence of such incidents. It is contended that releasing the petitioner on bail at this stage, may send a wrong message to society. Moreover, petitioner is also involved in three other criminal cases. Thus, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petition.

7. On being asked by the Court, as to whether the complainant, Kapil Sethi, and his wife have already been examined, learned State counsel submits that petitioner was, in fact, driving the car at the time of the incident and has been duly identified by the complainant while appearing as a witness in the witness-box.

He further submits that statements of all the witnesses have already been recorded.

8. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the record available before it.

9. In view of the stage of trial, this Court does not find any substantial reason to consider the present petition for the purpose of granting bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, present petition stands disposed of, with a direction to learned trial Court to expedite the trial proceedings and conclude the same at the earliest, in accordance with law.

10. A copy of this order be forwarded to the learned trial Court for information and necessary compliance.

06.11.2025

Lavisha

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>