

101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-4483-2021 IN/AND
CRM-M-5263-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.02.2021

Vicky Ram

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Dhiman, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

CRM-4483-2021

Prayer in this application is for preponing the date fixed in
the main petition.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is
allowed and the main case is taken up today for hearing.

CRM-M-5263-2021

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the
petitioner in FIR No.71 dated 04.10.2020 registered under Sections
379, 411, 201, 413, 414 IPC at Police Station Maloud, Ludhiana,
District Ludhiana.

At the very outset, it is worth noticing that on 28.10.2020,
the petition i.e. CRM-M No.34156 of 2020, filed by the brother of the

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

petitioner – Amrik Ram @ Amrik Singh, was dismissed by passing the following order:-

“As per the allegations in the FIR, the police while on patrol duty got the information that Naresh @ Kalu, Neeraj, Lakhvir Singh @ Lakhi, Amrik Ram (petitioner herein), Vicky Ram, are in the habit of committing theft of vehicles and they have stolen a Bolero and Mahindra Pick-up van and many other vehicles from Punjab and Haryana and are selling the same to Amrik Ram i.e. the petitioner and his brother Vicky Ram. On receiving such information, 02 accused persons namely Neeraj and Lakhvir Singh were arrested and the police recorded their disclosure statement in which they have again named the petitioner as a member of their group. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no such history of involvement in any other case and he is involved in one case registered under Section 120 IPC.

Counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that in pursuance to the registration of the FIR, many vehicles were recovered and 02 vehicles were yet to be recovered and the allegations against the petitioner as per the secret information and the disclosure statement is that after stealing the vehicles, they used to sold the same in the garage of the petitioner. It is further argued that there are number of cars lying in the garage of the petitioner and the ownership of the said cars needs to be verified and therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.”

For the sake of brevity, the facts are not reproduced again.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that all the vehicles have already been recovered and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner.

Counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the complainant has submitted that the petitioner was named in the secret

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

information along with the co-accused Amrik Ram @ Amrik Singh, whose anticipatory bail application was dismissed even by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and thereafter, he stands arrested on 21.02.2021. It is further submitted that even in the disclosure statement of the brother of the petitioner Amrik Ram @ Amrik Singh, who stands arrested, the petitioner is nominated as one of the accused, who used to sell the stolen cars along with him. Lastly, it is argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in order to crack the gang which is involved in committing theft of the vehicles and then selling the same.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

23.02.2021
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No