



226

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

CRM-M-60621-2024

Date of Decision: 29.01.2025

Maninder Pal @ Bittu @ Bindu

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Ms. Rajinder Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Davinder Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No. 27 dated 15.04.2024, registered under Sections 379-B and offence under Sections 411, 201, 379-B(2) of IPC added later on, at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled by the complainant are apparently false and unbelievable. She further contends that it is highly unbelievable that the complainant would know the name of the strangers, who had allegedly snatched the ear rings and nose pin of the complainant. She further contends that in the present case, the petitioner was arrested on 18.04.2024 and is in custody since then. Apart from that, mobile phone, motorcycle used in the crime and weapon of offence have already been recovered from his co-accused, namely, Surmukh Ram @ Pappu.



After completion of the investigation, the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C has already been presented before the competent Court of law and no purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. She further submits that similarly placed co-accused, namely, Surmukh Ram @ Pappu has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court, vide order dated 04.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-42358-2024 (Annexure P-2).

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground of gravity of offence.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 18.04.2024. After completion of investigation, challan has already been presented before the competent Court of law and there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose. Moreover, similarly placed co-accused has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2024 (Annexure P-2).

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

29.01.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No