

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

CRM-M-23674 of 2021

DECIDED ON: 14th January, 2022

Dilbagh Singh

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

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

This petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking anticipatory bail in case of FIR No.33 dated 11.2.2021, under Sections 394, 452 IPC, 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.

The FIR was got registered by Nirmal Singh, Assistant Branch Manager. On 11.2.2021, the complainant along with other employees were to go to Bank to deposit the cash. Five persons came to the office, one was standing outside the office and four entered the office. Two persons pulled out their revolver and robbed Rs. 3,82,084/-. Mobiles of Shivam and Nitesh were snatched. One of the person hit the complainant on the left side of his head. The accused took away one laptop, Rs.1500/-, Aadhaar Card, license, PAN Card, two ATM cards. On 8.3.2021, supplementary statement was made by the complainant stating that the incident was committed by Dilbagh Singh @ Ravi along with Karandeep Singh, Kulwinder Singh @ Kinda, Jatinder Singh and Satnam Singh, these persons were

nominated. Karandeep Singh was arrested on 8.3.2021. He disclosed

that the petitioner had planned and organized the incident in question. He being the employee was aware of huge money dealt in the office. The petitioner received Rs.30,000/- out of the stolen amount.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. He was named in the supplementary statement and the disclosure statement. The contention is that there is no evidentiary value of the supplementary statement and the disclosure statement. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Co-accused were granted regular bail.

Learned State counsel on instructions opposes the prayer and submits that deeper probe is required. It is a case of day light robbery. It is a case where employee and ex-employee of company were involved in the incident.

It would not be appropriate for this Court at this stage to develop upon the evidentiary value of the supplementary statement and the disclosure statement. *Suffice-to-say* that apart from the supplementary statement there is other evidence against the petitioner. The allegations are serious. The accused were armed with revolver. A day light robbery was committed. Custodial interrogation would be required to find out the specific role played by each of the accused and to apprehend the other co-accused.

Reliance on the fact that co-accused have been granted regular bail does not enhance the case of the petitioner. Prayer in the present petition is for anticipatory bail whereas the co-accused was released from the judicial custody.

Dismissed.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

14th January, 2022

reema

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

Yes