

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

108

**CRM-M-40054 of 2022
Date of Decision: 05.09.2022**

Trilochan Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi,
Advocate for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0076 dated 24.02.2022, under Sections 379, 411, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 473 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula, District Panchkula.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the name of the present petitioner has been nominated in the disclosure statement made by one of the co-accused and he was not even aware with regard to the selling of the motorcycle and his name was nominated only by way of false implication as he was involved in some other case and due to that reason his name has been nominated.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Addl. Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that he has received an advance copy of the present petition and has also sought instructions from the

concerned investigating officer. He submitted that it is the case where during interrogation it was found that the petitioner through some other co-accused namely Parmod handed over the motorcycle to one Pappu alongwith one fake certificate of registration also. He submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were that he had procured fake RC and other documents including affidavit and in this way a chain was formed by which the stolen motorcycle, fake RC and other documents were sold to another person and the petitioner was instrumental in the entire transaction. He further submitted that the petitioner is involved in six more cases of similar nature where the petitioner had procured fake documents pertaining to vehicles and sold to many other persons. He has further submitted that it is the fit case where the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for the purpose of recovery of stolen vehicles and also to break the chain which has been formed by stealing the motorcycle and other vehicles and then selling them on the basis of fake documents and has therefore, opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner although has been named on the basis of disclosure statement but the arguments raised by learned counsel for the State that he is involved in procuring fake documents and RCs for the purpose of selling of the stolen motorcycles particularly when he is involved in six more cases of similar nature, cannot be ignored and carries weight.

The incidents of stealing of motorcycles and other vehicles and selling them on the basis of fake documents are at large and it is necessary to break the chain and for that purpose as well, this Court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Apart from the same, the

antecedents of the petitioner whereby as per learned State counsel he is involved in six more cases of similar nature involving fake documents and RCs would also dis-entitle the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

September 05, 2022
dinesh

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No