

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50262 of 2019
Date of Decision: 29.11.2019

Jagmail Singh

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Avtar Singh Sandhu, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.74 dated 20.04.2019 registered for offences punishable under Sections 395, 452, 455, 473, 506 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code (for short, "IPC") and 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Samana, District Patiala.

Heard.

A bank dacoity took place on 20.04.2019 at Oriental Bank of Commerce, branch village Bamna, Tehsil Samana, District Patiala, when four persons entered the bank and at pistol point looted ₹7,27,530/- from the currency chest of bank.

The police arrested five persons on 30.04.2019 and during interrogation, statement of main accused, namely, Daljit Singh, was recorded. In his disclosure statement, he nominated the petitioner as their associate, who was with them in the bank dacoity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the

police has now proceeded to implicate his all family members in this case.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jagjit Singh submits that as per evidence collected during investigation, a call was made by Daljit Singh after robbery to petitioner to bring a vehicle to take them from the bank and he had come with there with the motorcycles to take them. The police requires his custodial interrogation to thoroughly investigate the case.

Keeping in view the gravity of offence and that the petitioner has been nominated by one of the co-accused, I find that this case requires to be thoroughly investigated. In such type of cases, the police has to rely on the statement of co-accused at initial stage before conducting further investigation.

Taking note of gravity of offence and facts mentioned in the FIR, I find no reason to exercise discretionary power of this Court to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to petitioner at this stage.

Dismissed.

November 29, 2019
jk

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No