

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-14745 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:28.4.2017

Jagdeep Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Janak Singh Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.68 dated 19.5.2016 registered for the offence under Section 379 IPC at Police Station Sadar Sangrur, District Sangrur.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

The FIR in the present case has been got registered by Parul Lalit, Manager, Punjab and Sind Bank, Saron. As per the allegations, on 7.5.2015 after finishing office work, the whole staff went back to their houses at about 5.30 p.m. after locking the bank. One ATM of their branch had been installed adjoining to the building of their Bank and they had appointed one private care taker to open this ATM at 7.00 a.m. and to lock the shutter at 9.00 p.m. Daily. One camera had been installed inside ATM

[2]

and one camera had been installed outside. As per the daily routine, they opened the Bank in the morning of 9.5.2016. They conducted random checking in the Bank as per daily routine and the camera installed inside the ATM was found to have been stolen. They checked the footage of CCTV cameras installed in their Bank, then one clean shaven person was found to have broken this camera and the unknown person had deliberately broken and stolen the camera of ATM of their Bank.

In the impugned order dated 22.7.2016 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, it has been mentioned that the CD of the CCTV footage was played in the Court. It supports the plea of the prosecution that the identity of the applicant is established from the CCTV footage, as he was seen taking away the CCTV camera.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the present petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

April 28, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No