

106 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48660-2021
Date of Decision: 22.11.2021

RANJIT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Deepak Sibal

Present: Mr.Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate for petitioner
Ms.Gunkirat Kaur, AAG Punjab

Deepak Sibal, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.10 dated 19.02.2021 under
Sections 457, 380, 411 IPC registered at police station Kotli Surat Mallian,
police district Batala.

Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner,
along with his co-accused, in the intervening night of 18/19th February
2021, after breaking the shutters of the complainant's shop committed theft
of dry fruits, cash and 70 mobile phones.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner
has been falsely implicated in this case; the only evidence against the
petitioner is an alleged disclosure statement of co-accused- Paramjit Singh
made by him in judicial custody which is not admissible as evidence; in any
case the alleged disclosure statement of co-accused- Paramjit Singh is said
to have been made after over a month of his arrest and that too in judicial

custody which on the face of it is highly improbable and that no further recoveries are required to be made from the petitioner.

Admittedly, in addition to the present case the petitioner is involved in 3 other criminal cases of similar nature. Thus, he is not only a habitual offender but has also violated the terms of bail on 3 occasions.

In the light of the above and because the petitioner is accused of having committed robbery in the dead of the night after breaking the shutters of the complainant's shop as also because recovery of over 41 mobile phones still remains to be made, no ground for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out, especially when the investigation in the case is still going on.

Dismissed.

It is clarified that the above observations have been made only for the limited purpose of deciding the present anticipatory bail application and the same would not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.11.2021
gk

(Deepak Sibal)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No