

*IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB
AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.*

Cr. Misc. M 42591 OF 2014
Date of decision:- 14.1.2015

Jaswinder Singh @ Jajji

Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

Respondent

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate.
Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate.
Mr. CS Brar, DAG, Punjab
Mr. PS Dhanoa, Advocate.

M.M.S.BEDI,J.

This order will dispose of two petitions, one filed by Jaswinder Singh @ Jajji (CRM M 42591 of 2014) and the second filed by Ajay Pal Singh (CRM M 44328 of 2014). The FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of Sanjiv Kumar Jindal alleging that main accused Sonu came along with three other co-accused and caused injuries on the person of Subash. In the second transaction, said Sonu came with 20/25 other people to the shop of the complainant and attacked him. A sum of Rs.5 lacs had been taken away after inflicting injuries.

Counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the incident in the present case is of 28.7.2014 where as the petitioners have been named for the first time in the supplementary statement recorded on 16.9.2014. The delay in recording of the supplementary statement has been claimed to be a circumstance, pointing towards the false implication of the petitioners. Counsel have further submitted that similarly circumstanced co-accused have been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail.

I have heard counsel for the parties and carefully gone through the photographs extracted from the CCTV footage indicating Jaswinder Singh @ Jajji, had been seen arriving on the spot on a motor cycle, entering the premises of the complainant and thereafter escaping on the motor cycle along with the other persons with muffled faces. The participation of the petitioner Jaswinder Singh @ Jajji is prima facie apparent. Similarly, petitioner Ajay Pal Singh, armed with a base ball bat is seen in the extracts, taken from the CCTV footage, having participated in the second transaction of the event.

In view of the corroborative evidence available on the record, the prima facie involvement of the petitioners in the occurrence , I do not find any ground to grant the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners.

Both the petitions are dismissed without prejudice to the right of the petitioners to seek the concession of regular bail, in accordance with law.

December 14 ,2014
TSM

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE