

**CRM-M-41474-2015 (O&M)**

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

**CRM-M-41474-2015 (O&M).  
Decided on: January 22, 2016.**

**Amarjit Singh**

**..... Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**..... Respondent(s)**

**\* \* \***

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

**PRESENT Mr.Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.**

**Ms.H.K.Athwal, DAG. Punjab.**

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

Petitioner along with his co-accused is alleged to have snatched a bag from the complainant Rajnish Kumar while he was going on his Aactiva Scooter with Ashok Kumar. He also allegedly fired shots at the complainant.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and he has been connected with the present case on the basis of alleged confessional statement made by the petitioner in custody in another case FIR No.156 of 17.9.2015, under Section 399 IPC, registered at Police Station Gur Harsahai, District Ferozepur.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner

**CRM-M-41474-2015 (O&M)**

as well as the State counsel and gone through the police file.

The petitioner was admittedly involved in 3-4 other criminal cases at different places. He was arrested on the basis of recovery of Rs.2,49,600/- from his car in above said FIR No.156 of 2015. It will not be appropriate for this Court to determine the admissibility and relevance of the confessional statement made by him in the said FIR as the amount recovered in the present case is stated to be connected by the prosecution agency with the amount allegedly recovered from a car which as per prosecution version belongs to the petitioner. No opinion can be formed at this stage, when the investigation is at threshold that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case.

Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations of having snatched the bag from the complainant and his involvement in other cases of similar nature, no ground is made out for the grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. The points raised by the counsel for the petitioner may be good enough to grant concession of regular bail but no extra ordinary exceptional circumstances exist to grant the conception of pre-arrest bail.

The petition is dismissed.

**January 22, 2016.**  
**rka**

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**