IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 11698 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.05.2015

Sukhwinder Singh @ Sukhi ..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab ..... Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NAVITA SINGH

Present:- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab, for the respondent.

NAVITA SINGH, J. (ORAL)

It is submitted by State counsel that the petitioner has joined investigation. However, it is further submitted that during interrogation it was revealed that he had committed theft in a Zen car and also mobile phone used in this case is to be recovered.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not present in Ludhiana on the relevant date, i.e. 23.02.2015. However, he has no proof of alibi at this stage. It is further submitted that the FIR was registered on 02.03.2015 mentioning that the complainant came to know about the names of the persons and lodged the case though at the time of incident, she did not know their names. It is contended that there is no explanation as to how the complainant came to know about the name of the petitioner and others.

The complainant was not required to disclose in the FIR as to how she named the accused persons. It is also stated that the other accused

RAMESH KUMAR MALIK
2015.05.21 16:19
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

named in the FIR are on regular bail.

It may be mentioned here that the case of anticipatory bail and regular bail is different and the relief of anticipatory bail is not to be granted liberally and should be in highly deserving cases.

In view of the above, the petition is dismissed.

(NAVITA SINGH)
JUDGE

21.05.2015
Ramesh

RAMESH KUMAR MALIK
2015.05.21 16:19
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court Chandigarh