

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

Sr. No.102

CRM-M No.8841 of 2017

Date of decision: 16.03.2017

Deep Kaur and another

....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short the 'Code') for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.236, dated 01.12.2016, registered under Sections 379-B IPC (Section 411 IPC added later on), at Police Station City Kharar, District SAS Nagar Mohali.

Seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioners, learned counsel submits that the petitioners are innocent and are not involved in any other criminal case; they have been falsely implicated; recovery has already been effected in the case and that the petitioners are ready to join the investigation.

The case of the prosecution is that petitioners alongwith their co-accused have snatched two gold bracelets of the complainant-Kamla Devi, who is aged about 80 years. As per the FIR, the petitioners alongwith their co-accused came in a car and stopped in front of the courtyard where the complainant was sitting. Thereafter, the complainant was informed that

some friend of herself was unwell, who had come to meet her and since she was unwell, she was sitting in the car. In order to meet her friend, the complainant sat in the car and as soon as she did so her gold bracelets which she was wearing in her both hands were snatched. Thereafter, she was pushed out of the car and the petitioners alongwith their co-accused fled away from the spot.

The allegations against the petitioners are serious wherein it is alleged that the petitioners alongwith their co-accused have snatched gold bracelets worn by an old age lady of 80 years by first making her to sit in a car and after snatching her gold bracelets pushing her out of the car before fleeing away.

The vehicle used in the offence is yet to be recovered; whether the petitioners are involved in such like offences in which other old ladies like the complainant have been targeted by the petitioners needs to be probed.

In view of the above, I am of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is warranted.

Resultantly, the present petition is dismissed.

Nothing observed herein above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

March 16, 2017
Jyoti 1

(i) Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
(ii) Whether reportable Yes/No