



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

204

CRM-M-29454-2025

Date of decision: 1st July, 2025

Harjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 121 dated 23.07.2022 registered under Sections 379-B and 506 of IPC (Sections 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Majitha, Amritsar.

2. As per the allegations, on 19.07.2022, the complainant along with his two companions had boarded a hired auto-rickshaw. On the way, he realised that the auto driver was not taking them to the destination. On his raising objection, the driver stopped the vehicle at a deserted place. Thereafter, he took out a weapon. Some unknown persons had also reached there. All of them snatched mobile phone and wallet of the complainant after striking blows with the weapons which they were having. The mobile phone of one of his companions had also been snatched. They were also injured.



Thereafter, the auto driver along with his companions had escaped from spot. The complainant while alleging that the auto rickshaw belonged to the petitioner and he was driving the same at the time of occurrence, prayed for taking action. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 25.09.2024. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of four days in registration of FIR which has not been explained. Trial would take time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has advance notice of the petition. She has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner and has vehemently argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender since two more cases of similar nature are pending against him. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6 The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have snatched the belongings of the complainant and his companions on 19.07.2022 and escaped with the same. He is in custody since 25.09.2024. Trial has commenced but is likely to take time since not even a single witness has been examined so far. The involvement of the petitioner in two



more cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. In the considered opinion of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by retaining the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

1st July, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*