



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

248

CRM-M-16751-2025

Date of decision: 2nd April, 2025

Sarabjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. M.S. Kathuria, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Swati Batra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The petitioner is making prayer for grant of benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 135 dated 10.04.2024 registered under Sections 379-B(2) and 506 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Division No. 7, Ludhiana on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant-Om Parkash alleging therein that on 10.04.2024, the petitioner along with the co-accused had snatched an amount of Rs. 1650/- from his pocket by extending threats to him and keeping an iron *datar* on his neck. He had been arrested in this case on 10.04.2024. Investigation stands completed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that investigation has been since completed, challan stands presented. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. No recovery remains to be effected from him. He is in custody since 10.04.2024. Co-accused Arsh Singh @ Harsh whose case is on similar footing, has been extended benefit of regular bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Trial is likely to take time. As such, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.



3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, who has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter, has argued that the petitioner along with the co-accused had committed offence of snatching money from the complainant by criminally intimidating him. Recovery of a sum of Rs. 450/- has been effected from him. There are chances of his absconding, if extended benefit of bail. It is argued that keeping the view the severity of the allegations, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Rival contentions of both sides have been considered.

5. The petitioner is in custody since 10.04.2024. Trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is well settled proposition of law bail is a rule and jail is an exception. Co-accused, against whom similar allegations have been levelled, has already been granted concession of bail by this Court. Keeping in view the nature of subject offence and the attending facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, 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.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

2nd April, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*