

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

101

CRM No.M-10952 of 2018

Date of decision:18.4.2018

Harbhajan Singh

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.B.S.Bairagi, Advocate, for the petitioner

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that when bail was granted to respondent no.4 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, even the police had concealed information from the Court that the machine alleged to have been stolen had in fact been recovered (by the police), with the police only having stated that respondent no.4 (applicant in the bail application) had joined investigation.

Having considered the above, the machine admittedly having been recovered and with it lying in the police station, I see no reason to cancel the bail granted to respondent no.4, because if eventually he is found guilty of having stolen the machine, the law would take its own course and he would be punished for the same.

Though the learned Additional Sessions Judge in his order dated 26.10.2017 has also referred to various other factors such as non-production of the bill of the machine by the present petitioner, nothing further is being stated in that regard by this Court, all of which would naturally be gone into by the investigating agency and the competent Court

at the appropriate stage.

In view of the above, I see no reason to entertain this petition,
which is accordingly dismissed.

18.4.2018
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No