

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

CRM M-2274 of 2016

Date of Decision: February 12, 2016

Kassam

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI.

-. -

Present:- Ms. Monisha Lamba, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

-. -

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

On the instructions of SI Sube Singh, it has been informed that the petitioner is one of the four persons involved in the case in the first transaction and that the remaining accused have been arraigned on the ground of having been found in possession of the property robbed.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the co-accused of the petitioner have been granted concession of regular bail and that the petitioner has been involved on the basis of the statements of his co-accused,

not known to him.. It has also been argued that the statement of accomplice would not be admissible in evidence.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and I am of the opinion that it will be premature to assess the evidence against the petitioner regarding relevancy or admissibility in the light of Section 133 read with Section 114 illustration (b) of the Evidence Act. No ground is made out to grant the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

Nothing said in this order will prejudice the rights of the petitioner to seek regular bail.

February 12, 2016
sanjay

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE