



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM- M No.31743 of 2025  
DATE OF DECISION : 25<sup>th</sup> AUGUST, 2025

Wajid

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

\* \* \* \*

Present : Mr. D. S. Matya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\* \* \* \*

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.171, dated 26.07.2021, registered under Sections 379, 392, 394, 120-B and 34 IPC at Police Station Udhyog Vihar, District Gurugram.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 23.07.2021 at about 10.15 pm, complainant took lift in a car which was going to Delhi Dawarka Turn in which four persons were already travelling. They forcibly made him sit in between them and lateron, snatched his debit card and other documents. They tried to withdraw money by using his ATM card but they failed to withdraw the cash as he had told them wrong password. However, they transferred an amount of ₹80,000/- from his Phonepe application to the account of one of the co-accused. After accused Mohd. Sakir was arrested, he disclosed the name of Mohd. Sajid Salla, Wajid (petitioner) and one relative of Mohd. Sajid who had



also committed this offence. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that one of the accused namely Sakir has been released on bail by the court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Gurugram vide order dated 16.05.2023, while two of the co-accused Mohd. Sajid Salla and Rashid have been released on bail by the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram vide orders dated 29.09.2022 and 29.04.2023, respectively. Learned counsel next contended that the offence was committed by some unknown persons and complainant had appeared in the court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, on 01.05.2023 and has categorically stated that he can not recognize the persons who had committed the robbery. Learned counsel further contended that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and since all the three co-accused have already been released on bail, whose case is identical to that of the petitioner, he is also entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and in view of gravity of the offence, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. The complainant has already made a statement before the concerned Magistrate that he can not recognize the assailants vide his statement dated 01.05.2023. Thereafter, three of the co-accused namely, Sakir, Mohd. Sajid Salla and Rashid have already been released on bail, whose case is identical to that of the petitioner and the petitioner too is thus entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity.



6. In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

25<sup>th</sup> August, 2025  
'raj'

( YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR )  
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>