

**CRM-M-41425-2014 (O&M)**

**-1-**

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

**CRM-M-41425-2014 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: January 08, 2015**

Amar Lal Setia

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI**

Present: Mr.R.K.Girdhar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr.Shilesh Gupta, Additional Advocate General,  
Punjab.

.....

**Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)**

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 438, Cr.P.C.,  
is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Amar Lal Setia,  
who has been booked for having committed the offences  
punishable under Sections 392, 420, 468, 471 and 472, IPC, and  
Section 25 of the Arms Act, in a case arising out of FIR No.246,  
dated 18.10.2014, registered at Police Station, City, Faridkot.

Learned counsel contends that there is not an iota of

legal evidence against the petitioner. The statement under Section 161, Cr.P.C. suffered by Bhupinder Singh would not connect the petitioner with the alleged offences. The raid was conducted at the house and shop but nothing incriminating was found.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Ram Lubhaya, CIA, Faridkot, submits that during investigation of the present case, accused Parampal Singh and Anantdeep Singh were arrested and they disclosed that in connivance with the petitioner, they were dealing with illegal weapons. He further contends that one Bhupinder Singh suffered statement under Section 161, Cr.P.C., in which it was disclosed that he had purchased .32 bore USA made *Beretta* pistol in a sum of ₹15 lacs from the petitioner. The said statement would clearly reveal that the petitioner, who was owner of a gun house at Abohar, was selling the illegal weapons after charging hefty amount from the general public.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, this Court is of the opinion that from the statement suffered by Bhupinder Singh, it has emerged on record that the petitioner was dealing in the

sale and purchase of illegal weapons.

No ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

**January 08, 2015**  
meenu

**(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)**  
**JUDGE**