



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

232

CRM-M-8903-2025

Date of decision: 22nd May, 2025

Monu Kumar @ Lovely

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 48 dated 31.05.2024 registered under Sections 379-B(2), 411 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Daresi, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. As per the prosecution case, the aforementioned FIR had been registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Vijay Kumar on 31.05.2024 alleging therein that on the same day at about 9:30 AM, he was standing outside his cycle repair shop, when two youths reached on the main road on a motorcycle. They snatched something from a passerby, who had raised alarm. On hearing so, the complainant tried to stop the snatchers. They hit him with their motorcycle due to which he fell down. The motorcycle rider took out a *datar* from his waistband and tried to hit



him on his head. Both of them were apprehended by the public persons and one of them was the present petitioner. The snatched mobile phone was recovered from them. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was formally arrested on the same day. Investigation stands completed and challan had been presented against him.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 31.05.2024. Trial is likely to take time. The co-accused Sajjan @ Saanjan, whose case is on similar footing, has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. Therefore, it is argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender as he is involved in six other cases, four of which are of similar nature. He had caused injury to the complainant at the time of snatching. There are chances of his absconding or committing offence, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 31.05.2024. The trial will take time to conclude. Only because of the fact that he is involved in other cases, he cannot be denied benefit of bail. Keeping in view the period spent by him in custody and allegations levelled against him but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that



the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

22nd May, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |