

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

CRM No.M-536 of 2018
Date of decision:19.1.2018

Anuj @ Anuj Kumar

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr.Ramesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Mr.Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana
...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order dated 11.1.2018, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Suraj Mal, submits that as regards the 3 phone numbers given by the petitioner on the last date of hearing, one of them (on the date of occurrence at Panchkula), was found to have been operating at Palwal, and one at Panipat. The call details of the 3rd phone number are not available at all.

Hence, as per the mobile call details of the phone numbers provided by the petitioner, obviously his presence cannot be proved to be at Panchkula as regards 2 phone numbers, but with the 3rd phone numbers' call details not available.

However, learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the petitioners' name was disclosed not by just one co-accused, Satyawan, but by 3 others also, namely, Gulab Singh, Pankaj Singh and Sandeep.

In such circumstances, with the kind of mayhem that occurred at Panchkula, I am not at all inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

19.1.2018
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether Reportable Yes/No