

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

**CRM-M-49354 of 2021
Date of decision: 25.11.2021**

Prithvi Singh

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. S. S. Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

The petitioner aggrieved of the order rejecting the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 388 dated 1.11.2021, under Section 379 IPC (Section 201 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Fatehabad is before this Court under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

The brief facts are that FIR was registered on the complaint of Vijay alleging that during the night of 31.10.2021, he parked his motorcycle near Kiryana shop, Salam Khera Road, Bighar. After some time, he found that the motorcycle was stolen. During investigation, CCTV footage was collected. Father of co-accused Mukesh (juvenile) produced his son along with the motorcycle in question. The juvenile suffered a statement regarding involvement of the petitioner in the incident.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner

was not named in the FIR, he was named in a disclosure statement, the motorcycle is already recovered and no custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail. She submits that apart from the disclosure statement, the petitioner is visible in CCTV footage identified by the complainant. Further contention is that the co-accused admitted his involvement in another incident of theft. She further submits that a deeper probe is required.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, the evidentiary value of the disclosure statement would be subject matter of trial. Suffice to say that in the case in hand, apart from the disclosure statement there is other evidence with the investigating agency. The petitioner is visible in CCTV footage.

No case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

The petition is dismissed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

25th November, 2021

mk

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No