

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

**CRM-M No.45699 of 2021
Date of Decision: 22.02.2022**

Ajay Kumar and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Nitin Mittoo, Advocate
for the petitioner.
(joined through virtual mode)

Ms. Ishneet Kaur, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending their arrest in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.121 dated 08.09.2021 registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar, under Sections 457, 380, 411 IPC, both the petitioners have moved this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by complainant Jeeto in the subject FIR, are that while she, along-with her family members as well as their neighbours named Surjeet Kaur and Gurwinder Kaur had gone to visit their relatives, the petitioners and their co-accused committed theft of articles like blankets, bed-sheets, utensils

etc. in their houses.

Status-report has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Phillaur, District Jalandhar (Rural).

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel in the instant petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case whereas they had no concern with the alleged crime and therefore, they deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Per contra, learned State counsel argues that the petitioners and their co-accused broke open the locks of the houses of the complainant and her afore-said neighbours and stole away the said household articles and keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by them, this petition be dismissed.

The names of both the petitioners find specific mention in the FIR as the accused who, along-with their co-accused, had committed theft in the houses of the above-named persons. Therefore, the possibility of the requirement of their custodial interrogation cannot be ruled out.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the nature of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioners, this Court is of the considered opinion that they (petitioners) do not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

February 22, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>