

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-29160-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-4.8.2021

Manpreet Singh @ Manni

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Jaspal Singh.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.187 dated 25.7.2020 at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, District Patiala under Sections 379-B, 307, 473 and 427 of Indian Penal Code.
2. As per the case of prosecution a secret information was received on 25.7.2020 to the effect that the petitioner alongwith Lachhmi @ Lachho, Karamjit Kaur @ Kakki, Rupo and Satya indulged in snatching gold ornaments at busy places and that even on the given day they were coming in a car bearing registration No.PB-65-Z-3957 driven by Manpreet. It is the

case of prosecution that pursuant to receipt of said information barricading was held and the aforesaid car, upon being noticed, was signaled to stop but the driver of the car instead of halting the car tried to run over ASI Sandeep Singh with an intention to kill him but somehow he managed to save himself and consequently the car struck against the official vehicle of the police. It is further alleged that the petitioner Manpreet Singh alias Manni and another lady Satya managed to escape while the other three were apprehended at the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, even if, the allegations as levelled in the FIR are taken to be correct, still no offence under Section 379-B IPC can be said to have been made out. It has been submitted that the allegations pertaining to Section 307 IPC have simply been cooked up so as to implicate the petitioner. It has specifically been submitted that in the instant case there is no such allegation pertaining to any incident of snatching as far as the instant FIR is concerned.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender having been involved in a large number of cases and, as such, does not deserve the concession of bail.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. The alleged secret information is only to the effect that the petitioner and co-accused used to indulge in snatching jewellery etc. at busy places. Apart from said allegations, the petitioner is alleged to have made an attempt to run over a police official. However, neither any recovery of stolen or snatched jewellery had been effected from the co-accused, who were arrested at the spot nor anyone from the police party is stated to have been injured. Under

these circumstances, the petition merits acceptance and is hereby accepted. It is ordered that the petitioner, in the event of arrest, be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

4.8.2021

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No