

2025:PHHC:123991



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

237

**CRM-M-39008-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.09.2025**

Ravi Kumar @ Ravi Sahni**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

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

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 45 dated 02.03.2024, registered under Section 379-B of IPC (Sections 411 and 34 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Focal Point, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant Navneet Singh alleging therein that on 02.03.2024, he was going towards his factory on his cycle. Satish Raut a co-worker was also following him on his cycle. When they reached near Goldstar Factory, Focal Point, Ludhiana at about 7 AM, suddenly three youths riding on a splendor make motorbike came from back side. They stopped the bicycles of complainant and Satish Raut and by extending

2025:PHHC:123991



threats to them and by showing an iron dah, they forcibly snatched his mobile phone make Vivo having sim card No.9569879196 and mobile phone Jio of Satish Raut and then fled away. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 05.03.2024, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement to the effect that he had come to know that the petitioner along with co-accused Manjeet @ Manjit Kumar and Abhishek Singh had snatched their mobile phones by using a motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-10HZ-0854. The petitioner and co-accused were arrested on 06.03.2024. On conducting their search, two mobile phones were recovered from their custody. The petitioner disclosed that the mobile phone snatched from the complainant had been sold by him to some passerby. The mobile phone belonging to Satish Raut was recovered from co-accused Abhishek Singh which was duly identified by him. Offence under Section 411 of IPC was added. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented in the Court.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR and has been nominated subsequently. He is in custody since 06.03.2024. Trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. There are no chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses. Similarly situated co-accused Manjeet @ Manjit Kumar has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 04.09.2024 passed in **CRM-M-23256-2024**. On parity, the petitioner too deserves the same benefit. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

2025:PHHC:123991



4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding or even intimidating the witnesses who are yet to be examined. Therefore, it is argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record.
6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have snatched the mobile phone belonging to the complainant and his companion on 02.03.2024. He was arrested on 06.03.2024. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial is likely to take time. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Pendency of other cases cannot be made a ground for denying him bail in the peculiar circumstances. Similarly situated co-accused has already been granted concession of bail by this Court, as mentioned above. It is well settled proposition of law that the bail is the rule and jail is an exception. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.
7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.09.2025
Wassem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No