

2025.PHHC.007186



211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64869-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: January 18, 2025

Manjeet

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

Present:- Mr. Chirag Chugh, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, AAG Haryana.

SUDHIR SINGH, J. (ORAL)

CRM-50838-2024

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed, subject
to all just exceptions.

Main case (O&M)

Petition herein is under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik
Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the
petitioner, in FIR No.220 dated 23.04.2024, under Section 379-B read with
Section 34 the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police
Station Kharkhoda, District Sonapat.

2. Succinct facts of the prosecution case are that on 23.04.2024,
complainant, namely, Akhilesh Kumar stated that he was going on his duty, on
a motor-cycle bearing registration No.HR11D-8983 CT Deluxe of red and
black colour, when three boys snatched the motor-cycle after extending him
threats and ran away from the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has
falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the petitioner
has been in custody since 25.04.2024. The investigation is complete and
charges have already been framed. There is nothing to be recovered from the

petitioner and he is not required for any further custodial interrogation and that there is no likelihood of him tampering with evidence or influencing prosecution witnesses. It is yet further submitted that the matter between the parties has been amicably settled vide Annexure P-3 (an affidavit tendered by the complainant).

3.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that co-accused, namely Ritik @ Ritik Verma, has already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 13.12.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the petition, expressing concerns about the possibility of the petitioner fleeing from trial proceedings, if granted bail. However, he does not controvert the factum of grant of regular bail to the co-accused, as noticed above.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and gone through the case file.

6. Concededly, the petitioner has been in custody since 25.04.2024. Charges have already been framed. Similarly placed co-accused Ritik @ Ritik Verma, has already been granted the concession of regular bail. Besides that, the matter is stated to have been compromised between the parties as indicated in Annexure P.3.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail upon his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUDHIR SINGH)
JUDGE

January 18, 2025

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No