



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

**CRM-M-10181-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.09.2025**

Robin

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

CRM-7518-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present third petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.83 dated 10.02.2024 under Section 379-A, 34 & 201 of IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station Saran, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1).

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Shubham Kumar Jain. It was alleged therein that on 08.02.2024 at about 07:55 PM, when he was walking from Nain Chowk towards Air Force Station, in the meantime, two unknown persons riding on a bike came there and snatched his phone. Though, he made an attempt to chase them but he failed to nab them. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrested on 28.03.2024. On completion of



the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 06.11.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing of CRM-M-40425-2024 and CRM-M-63095-2024, however, the same were declined vide orders dated 28.08.2024 and 19.12.2024, respectively. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order passed by this Court in **CRM-M-10659-2025** dated 23.07.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Aabid, has been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She submits that in all there are 15 prosecution witnesses, out of them only 02 witnesses have been examined including the complainant. She endorsed the fact that the case of petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Aabid, who has already been granted bail by this Court. She has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.



5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 28.03.2024. Out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, 02 have been examined so far. Victim-complainant has also been examined. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Aabid, has already been granted bail by the Court vide order dated 23.07.2025 passed in **CRM-M-10659-2025**. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has completed the incarceration of about 1 ½ years as on 08.09.2025.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

7. 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.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

10.09.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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