

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

CRM-M No.6936 of 2016

Date of Decision:-11.04.2016

Suman Kumar.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Nipun Vashisht, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kuldip Tiwari, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
assisted by ASI Suresh Kumar.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

Prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner Suman Kumar in case FIR No.15 dated 30.01.2016 for offences punishable under Sections 148, 149, 186, 332, 342, 353, 379-B, 506 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Rewari, Sadar.

As per allegations of Dharampal-SDO, petitioner was member of a mob which restrained the complainant and member of the raiding/checking party regarding theft of electricity, and caused injuries and snatched away LLI Reports and electric meters from them.

It is contended that on account of complaint filed by the petitioner, who is ex-servicemen, regarding connivance of the Government

officials in facilitating theft of electricity by laying of unauthorised lines, false case has been foisted upon the petitioner.

Learned State Counsel assisted by ASI Suresh Kumar has filed a reply dated 10.04.2016 of DSP concerned wherein it has been averred that the petitioner along with several other co-accused persons had assaulted a team of enforcement wing of the electricity department and had snatched LL-1 form and electric meter from the said team. Apart from that, the entire team was held captive for quite a considerable time by the petitioner with aid of the other co-accused and the party was criminally intimidated.

Learned State Counsel further submits that only accused Mohinder Singh has been arrested on 12.3.2016 and a snatched electric meter has been recovered from his possession. Rest of the accused are evading arrest. He further states that petitioner has joined investigation however, he has cooperated.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, keeping in view the nature and gravity of allegations, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out as the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary for fair and proper investigation.

In view of the above, the present petition seeking anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

April 11, 2016
Vinay