

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

CRM-M-23645-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-22.8.2022

Surjit Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Attri, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Sukhdev Singh.

Mr. Pankaj Kundra, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate for the complainant.

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.44 dated 28.4.2022, Police Station Sadar, Kapurthala under Sections 379-B, 34 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that on 28.4.2022 when the complainant was proceeding to Jalandhar in his car bearing registration No.PB-02-CD-4467, then one unidentified white coloured Swift car obstructed his car and four boys alighted from the said car and forcibly pulled him out of his car and also gave beatings to him. It is alleged that the said boys thereafter took his car and fled away from the spot. It is alleged that he had been making inquiries and later he came to know that two of the persons, who had snatched his car,

were Suraj Rana and Regan. The complainant suspected that his car had been snatched at the instance of Laddi agent, with whom there was some monetary dispute regarding purchase of the car in question.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even as per the FIR, he is not amongst the persons, who had snatched the car in question and that the only allegation levelled in the FIR is based on a suspicion to the effect that the complainant's car had been snatched at the instance of the petitioner.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that since there had been some monetary dispute between the petitioner and the complainant regarding sale of i20 car, therefore, involvement of the petitioner is quite apparent. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that pursuant to interim directions, the petitioner has joined investigation and is not required for any custodial interrogation.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the nature of allegations and the fact that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is not stated to be required for any custodial interrogation, the petition is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 27.5.2022 are hereby made absolute, subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join 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.

22.8.2022

pankaj

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Yes / No
Yes / No