



229

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

CRM-M-8215-2025

Date of decision :17.09.2025

Munish Kumar @ Manu

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amanpreet S. Bathindewala, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.113 dated 09.08.2024 under Sections 304, 317(2) and 111 of BNS, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Anguri Devi. It was alleged that on 08.08.2024 at about 5:45 PM she was going from her home to Aashram while carrying her bag. When she reached near her son's shop, then 02 young men came on a motorcycle and snatched her bag and ran away. Her son, namely, Naresh Kumar, came out of the shop and tried to chase them, however, both of them escaped on their motorcycle. The bag she was carrying had a purse containing cash of Rs.1300, one samsung mobile and key of her Almirah. On enquiring by her son, they came to know that the boys who snatched the bag were Kamaldeep Gupta @ Ashu and Munish Kumar @ Manu (petitioner). The request was made to take the legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 10.08.2024. The petitioner approached the



Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 18.11.2024. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the alleged occurrence taken place on 08.08.2024 whereas the complainant had not named the petitioner, however, thereafter the allegations has been made that on enquiry at their own level, they came to know about the snatchers, who were Kamaldeep Gupta @ Ashu and Munish Kumar @ Manu (present petitioner). It is submitted that the allegations made are totally without any basis. It is submitted that both the complainant and her son, namely, Naresh Kumar, had been examined before the trial Court and they had not supported the case of the prosecution. He submits that though the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He thus, submits that once the alleged victim had herself not supported the case of the petitioner, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is habitual offender who is involved in 02 other cases of similar nature. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 09 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been examined and 03 witnesses have given up. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.



5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 10.08.2024. The complainant and her son had been examined before the trial Court, who had not supported the case of the prosecution. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 01 month and 16 days as on 16.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases, however, he is on bail in those cases.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.09.2025

ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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