

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

CRM-M-12927-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 27.5.2020

NAVJYOT SINGH AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him them FIR No.33 dated 20.2.2020 under Sections 457/384/323/506/34 IPC at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Charan Singh wherein it has been alleged that on 16.2.2020, he went to sleep after having dinner and later at 12 A.M. when he was working on his computer in the room constructed on the upper storey of his house, two unidentified persons jumped over the wall of his house and gave blows with a plastic pipe. After giving blows, the said persons fled away after scaling the wall. It is further alleged that subsequently on 20.2.2020 when he went out to open the main gate of the house at about 8 A.M., he noticed a small polythene bag lying in the house in which there was a written note vide which a demand of Rs. 10 lacs was made while stating that the said amount was the price of his life.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are not named in the FIR and were not even identified and are being nominated as accused on the basis of statement of co-accused namely Jatinder.
4. Shri Gaurav Dhuriwala, Senior DAG, Punjab to whom an advance copy of the petition has been served, accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that it is a case where an attempt of extortion was made by the petitioners in connivance with Jatinder and that after the accused had given beatings to the complainant on 16.2.2020, the complainant installed CCTV cameras and the person who had left the ransom note on 20.2.2020 is seen in CCTV footage. It is submitted that the said CCTV footage was shown to the son of the complainant and who identified the person to be Jatinder Singh. It has further been submitted that upon arrest of said Jatinder Singh he was interrogated and upon interrogation, he disclosed the names of the present petitioners. It is further submitted that the petitioners are also involved in another case under Section 379 IPC and in these circumstances the petitioners do not deserve the concession of bail.
6. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. The CCTV footage is a very important piece of evidence and since one of the co-accused namely Jatinder Singh who was identified in CCTV footage has made a disclosure statement nominating the petitioners as co-accused, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in view of serious nature of allegations.

7. The petition, as such, is sans any merit and is hereby dismissed. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be taken to be an expression on merits of the main case.
8. However, in case the petitioners surrender before the trial Court within two weeks from today and move an application for grant of regular bail, the trial Court shall endeavour to dispose of the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of two weeks from filing of such application.

27.5.2020

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No