

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Sr. No.214****Case No. : CRM-M-35414-2024****Decided On : January 15, 2025**

Suraj Singh Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

* * *

Present : Ms. Divya Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral) :

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0268 dated 03.11.2023, under Sections 379-B, 506 and 34 IPC and Sections 25-54-59 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Islamabad, District Amritsar.

2. The allegation is that an amount of Rs.10,000/- was snatched while the complainant was coming back to home from his shop. The alleged snatching was done by total four accused. Subsequently, on account of arrest of the petitioner in some other criminal case, prosecution has shown involvement of present petitioner on the basis of disclosure statement only.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that solely on the basis of disclosure statement, prosecution cannot build up its case and there would be very bleak chances for the Court, even to convict the accused, only on the basis of disclosure statement. However, there is no denial that in the present



CRM-M-35414-2024

: 2 :

case, prosecution has shown recovery of Rs.1,000/-, which, as per counsel for the petitioner, cannot be connected with the snatched set of amount i.e. Rs.10,000/- from the complainant.

4. The petitioner is stated to be inside the jail for the last more than one year, though he is also involved in other similar cases also. In most of the cases, the prosecution has framed the petitioner as accused on the basis of disclosure statement. Involvement of the petitioner is yet to be proved by the prosecution during trial. As per version of learned State counsel, only charges have been framed in the present case and process of recording of evidence is yet to start.

5. Taking into consideration the submissions addressed and perusing the record, I do not find substantial reason not to consider the plea of regular bail of the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in this case, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. 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.

8. The observation made here-in-above 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 evidence available on record.

**CRM-M-35414-2024****: 3 :**

9. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

Petition stands disposed of.

January 15, 2025*monika***(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>