

270

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

**CRM-M No.18754 of 2017  
Date of Decision: 01.06.2017**

**SATNAM SINGH @ PAROTHA**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**.....Respondent**

**CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH***

Present: Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)**

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.24 dated 21.03.2017, registered under Section 379-B/34 IPC and under Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Division No.8, Ludhiana.

As per allegations in the FIR a Volkswagen car bearing registration No.CH01-AB-2525, Model 2010 was allegedly snatched by three persons, however names of four persons namely Yadwinder Singh, Narinder Singh, Rao Birinder and Karanvir came to be known at a subsequent stage, who were involved in the aforesaid snatching.

Petitioner was not involved in the aforesaid incident. The name of the petitioner was disclosed by Yadwinder Singh by alleging that he used to sell the stolen vehicles to the petitioner. Petitioner was arrested and a Tata Safari car was recovered from him. That vehicle was claimed to be a stolen vehicle by the police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was no FIR registered in respect of Tata Safari vehicle, nor the Police collected any incriminating material viz.-a-viz. the statement of any owner or the complainant in respect of theft of the aforesaid vehicle at any time. In the absence of such incriminating material, the said vehicle cannot be presumed to be a booty of any theft.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Raj Kumar admitted the aforesaid factual submissions and submitted that the challan has been presented on 30.05.2017.

At this stage, without adverting to the merits of the case and looking to the aforesaid position, I am of the view that petitioner, who is in custody since 05.04.2017 can be granted concession of regular bail.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail, subject to his furnishing

adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

June 01, 2017.

*Atik*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No