

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

**CRM-M-3934-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.04.2022**

Amarjeet Singh @ Bablu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.67 dated 07.06.2018, registered at Police Station 'B' Division, Amritsar, under Sections 382, 34, 379-B (2) IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the above-noted FIR was registered against some unknown person; that the petitioner was indicted on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused; that at the time of having been named in the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the petitioner had already been in custody in FIR No.9 dated 25.06.2018, registered under Section 379-B, 411 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Majitha Road, Amritsar City, wherein the petitioner himself surrendered on 27.01.2020 and he was released on bail and that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the present case, as nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner.

Learned State counsel submits that in the FIR, the complainant has specifically stated that three haircut young persons had snatched his motorcycle on a pistol point and had fled with the motorcycle.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There are specific allegations against the petitioner as well as co-accused. During investigation of the case, co-accused, Sanjaypal Singh @ Bhundi and Navdeep Singh @ Sunny @ Pati were brought on production warrant and they had disclosed about the crime committed and involvement of the petitioner along with them in the commission thereof. Thus, the involvement of the petitioner is writ large. Besides, the petitioner is involved in one more FIR and is a habitual offender.

Considering the very nature of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is a must. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

18.04.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No