

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224)

CRM-M-31727-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 30.09.2019

Pardeep alias Dilla

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order of this court dated 29.08.2019, an affidavit of Sh. Ashwin Shenvi, Sr. Superintendent of Police, Jind, has been filed in Court today by the learned State counsel, with a copy thereof given to the learned counsel for the petitioner, from which learned State counsel draws attention to paragraph 5, wherein it is stated that during the course of investigation, the call record details of the mobile number used by one Vishal @ Gaurav, a co-accused of the petitioner and son of the complainant, as also the mobile number used by the petitioner between 15.04.2019 and 15.07.2019, has been procured and analyzed, a perusal of which shows that there were telephonic conversations between them for more than 40 times on different dates.

It has further been stated in the affidavit that on 25.05.2019, i.e. the date of commission of the offence (thefts) from the house of the complainant, the location of the petitioners' mobile number was detected in Jind, with 8 calls having been made between the two of them.

The contention therefore is that the petitioner and his co-accused were well acquainted with each other.

Further, it has been stated that there are 7 other FIRs registered against the petitioner at various places, including one for the alleged commission of an offence punishable under Section 302 read with Section 34 of the IPC, in which he was convicted and sentenced.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in that case, the sentence of the petitioner has been suspended.

Be that as it may, in view of the affidavit filed by the SSP, Jind, I see no ground to entertain this petition by which the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

However, nothing stated herein above shall be taken to be an observation of this court on the merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, but only in the context of the petition seeking anticipatory bail.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

30.09.2019

vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: Yes