

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

***CRM No.M-15542 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.05.2016***

Sandeep Singh @ Sunil

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Nitesh Singhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S. Virk, AAG, Punjab.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.21 dated 12.03.2016, under Sections 380/457/342/506 IPC, registered at Police Station Dhanaula, District Barnala.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Briefly, it may be noticed that FIR came to be registered on the statement of Mithu Singh, an employee of the Punjab State Warehousing Corporation. Occurrence is stated to be of the intervening night of 11/12.03.2016. Complainant asserted that he along with one Karnail Singh and Karam Singh were discharging their duties of watchmen/chowkidar and at about 12.30 A.M., a number of persons gained forcible entry at the warehouse godown and tied them up with their cots, snatched away the mobile phones and removed the batteries. Thereafter, three trucks entered the godown and a theft of 320 bags of rice was committed by loading the same in these three trucks.

Although in the initial version of the complainant, names of the assailants were not given out but in a supplementary statement recorded on 27.03.2016, the name of the present petitioner along with a number of other co-accused surfaced.

Learned State counsel has apprised the Court that during the course of investigation, a recovery of 250 bags of rice has been effected from the co-accused, namely, Gurpreet Singh and whose name was mentioned by the complainant in the supplementary statement.

As per such disclosure statement, co-accused as also the present petitioner are stated to be involved in other incidents of theft of rice from other locations.

In the light of such serious allegations and the heavy recovery effected from the other co-accused and whose names were specifically mentioned by the complainant in the supplementary statement, it would be a fit case for a thorough and deep probe to be conducted and for which custodial interrogation of the present petitioner may well be warranted.

This Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

18.05.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**