

CRM-M-20659-2017

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

CRM-M-20659-2017

Date of Decision: 02.06.2017

Sarabjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Ramesh Kumar Bamal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Sarabjeet Singh has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.203 dated 18.05.2016, registered at Police Station Sampla, under Sections 201, 302, 34, 379 and 397 of the Indian Penal Code.

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

From the record, I find that as per the prosecution version, Manish, brother of complainant, who was a driver by profession, was employed as such on vehicle i.e. HIVA Dumper bearing registration No.HR-46D-5587, which was owned by Ravinder. On 17.05.2016, at about 11.00 P.M., Manish was coming to Rohtak from Sonapat while driving the said dumper after unloading the goods. A conversation in this regard also took place between the complainant and his brother-Manish. Thereafter, they

CRM-M-20659-2017

tried to call Manish, but the call could not be connected and the said fact was told to the employer of Manish namely Ravinder. Thereafter, they searched for the vehicle as well as of said Manish in the night, but in vain. However, on the next day, at around 11.00 A.M, the dead body of Manish was found lying in the drain having injuries. It is also mentioned in the FIR that some unknown person has committed the murder of Manish while snatching his dumper and cash amounting to ₹26,300/-.

The petitioner has been named by co-accused. The recovery of HIVA Dumper is yet to be effected and the petitioner has been instrumental in the sale of the said HIVA Dumper.

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

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

02.06.2017
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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