



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

224

CRM-M-47578-2025
Date of decision: 02.09.2025

MALKEET SINGH ALIAS MEENAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Karan Kapoor, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 91 dated 16.09.2022 under Section 379-B(2) read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Khalchian, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The present FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant Abdul Razak, a truck driver, who alleged that on 13.09.2022, after-parking his truck near a godown, he was approached by two persons. One of them on the pretext of asking time and taking a selfie with his mobile phone, snatched the same, while the other caught hold of him. It is further alleged that the accused thereafter robbed him of his purse containing his Aadhar

Card, ATM Card, PAN Card, voter ID Card and Rs. 10,000/- cash. In the course of incident, one accused inflicted a datar blow on his head and another reverse blow on his right shoulder causing him to fall on the ground. On his raising alarm, both the accused fled from the spot.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 02 years, 11 months and 14 days and the trial is not likely to conclude soon.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that the petitioner had not only committed the offence of snatching but had also caused injury by the use of datar. He contends that 05 witnesses out of the total 10 witnesses have been examined and the case is now fixed for evidence on 05.09.2025. He further contends that the petitioner is accused in 04 other FIRs under the NDPS Act. He, however, does not dispute that in 01 case he already stands acquitted while in the remaining 03 cases, he has been granted the concession of bail by the Courts. He also does not dispute that the petitioner has already undergone an actual sentence of 02 years, 11 months and 14 days.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of nearly 02 years 11 months and 14 days in the present FIR and only 05 witnesses out of 10 witnesses have been examined so far and noticing that he is on bail in other pending cases, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

SEPTEMBER 02, 2025

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No