





said window, strong room was also targeted but it could not be opened as its lock got damaged. At that time, it could not be confirmed whether any cash was stolen or not because of non-opening of strong room till then. However, there was theft of three laser printers, four batteries and one DVR and damage to one kiosk passbook printer was also reported. On the basis of this information, the FIR in hand was registered. During investigation, CCTV footage, finger prints and tower location record were taken. The petitioner along with co-accused were also arrested. One Scorpio Car bearing registration no. UP-86-AN-9472, which was used in the incident, was also recovered from the petitioner.

Learned counsel for petitioner *inter alia* contended that the petitioner has been nominated as accused in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner was arrested in this case on 06.01.2025 and Scorpio vehicle with registration no. UP-86-AN-9472 was falsely shown to be recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner was driver of the vehicle, which had been hired by accused persons and the petitioner was not even seen in CCTV footage. Co-accused Sunny Kumar @ Sunny, who has actively participated in the crime allegedly committed in this case, has already been granted regular bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari on 07.03.2025 and other co-accused Yusuf has also been granted regular bail by the learned trial Court. The petitioner was arrested on 06.01.2025. Learned counsel further urged that trial of the case is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars any more. It has been prayed that the



**CRM-M-23401-2025**

**3**

petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, strongly opposed the present bail petition while contending that the petitioner also actively participated in the crime along with other co-accused and recovery of Scorpio vehicle was made on the disclosure statement of accused. The present case pertains to theft in the bank. So, keeping in view gravity of offence and seriousness of allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to concession of regular bail. He prayed that the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

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

The petitioner has not been named in the FIR and his name surfaced in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Recovery in the present case has already been effected. As per the Custody Certificate, which has been placed on record, the petitioner has already undergone custody period of 07 days and 07 months in this case. Co-accused Sunny Kumar @ Sunny and Yusuf have already been released on bail. Conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time. So, no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned Trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed



**CRM-M-23401-2025**

**4**

to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

**August 18, 2025**

*monika*

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)  
JUDGE**

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