

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

CRM-M-15551-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.12.2017

Charanjit Singh @ Nandu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.02 dated 05.01.2015 under Sections 457, 380 IPC, registered at Police Station Sarhali, District Tarn Taran.

Vide order dated 05.05.2017, while issuing notice of motion, interim bail was granted to the petitioner, after noticing that a serious offence has been committed, in which locks installed at the ATM had been cut with a welding set and an amount of Rs.4,36,300/- has been robbed from ATM machine. It was also noticed in the order that though the incident had taken place on 05.01.2015 and co-accused of the petitioner was arrested on the same day and later on, the petitioner filed CRWP-7-2017, in which vide order dated 05.01.2017, a Warrant Officer was appointed and vide order dated 03.02.2017, the said petition was disposed of noticing that the detenues in the case,

including Sandeep Kaur, wife of petitioner Charanjit Singh @ Nandu, who was petitioner No.3 in that petition, were involved in the present FIR No.2 dated 05.01.2015.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gurpal Singh, submits that the petitioner, during the period, when he was on interim bail, has again been booked for allegedly committing the theft in ATM. He has also been booked in FIR No.123 dated 16.10.2017 under Sections 22, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Fattu Dyinga, District Kapurthala. It is thus submitted that the petitioner is misusing the concession of interim bail and he has repeated the same offence.

In view of the submissions made by learned State counsel, specially in view of the fact that the petitioner has been arrested in subsequent FIR No.123 dated 16.10.2017, in which the offences are of serious nature, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

01.12.2017

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No