

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

CRM-M No. 30610 of 2018
Date of decision : April 09, 2019

Inderjit Singh

..... Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

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

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, DAG Punjab

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.100, dated 10.4.2018, registered under Section 379B of the IPC, at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

Allegations made by the complainant were that he was working in Steelmen Telecom Private Limited and had reached Ludhiana on 10.4.2018 from where he took auto rickshaw to reach Tower Range Chowk to check the range of Jio tower and when he was checking the same, three young persons snatched a kit bag, telephone, mobile phones, power bank, purse and ran away. The complainant further alleged that if those persons came before him he could recognize them. On 13.4.2018, the police received a secret information about the presence of the petitioner and the

other two co-accused and the Investigating Officer reached there with the complainant. The complainant identified all the three persons. However, two were arrested and one escaped. On the arrest of the two co-accused, the person who escaped was identified as the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is Inderjit Singh son of Mohan Lal. As per the co-accused, the third person who escaped was Paramjit Singh @ Shanty and not the petitioner.

Learned DAG Punjab, on instructions from ASI Om Parkash, has argued that no doubt the name Paramjit Singh was wrongly mentioned instead of Inderjit Singh but the petitioner is known as Shanty and his parentage was correct and moreover, he was identified by the complainant and even the learned Addl. Sessions Judge had recorded in his order that though there was discrepancy in the name yet the identification of the petitioner was not in doubt.

Counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail and he has joined the investigation two to three times.

Be that as it may, in my considered opinion the petitioner was not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail in the above facts. Consequently, this petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending C.Ms, if any, also stand disposed of.

April 09, 2019
`kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No