

CRM-M-48331-2021

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

CRM-M-48331-2021

Date of decision:20.05.2022

Satnam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. R.K.Grewal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.122 dated 26.09.2021, registered at Police Station Shambhu, District Patiala, under Sections 457 and 380 IPC and Section 411 IPC (added later on).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged occurrence took place in the intervening night of 31.08.2021/01.09.2021, whereas the matter was reported to the police on 26.09.2021 i.e. after a delay of 25 days; that during investigation, co-accused Paramjit Singh, who is brother-in-law of the petitioner, suffered a disclosure statement under Section 27 of the Evidence Act to the effect that he in connivance with the present petitioner had committed the theft, and that recovery of Rs.30,000/- has already been effected from the co-accused, who has since been released on bail. On this premise, the learned counsel prays that the petitioner be released on bail.

CRM-M-48331-2021

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner has specifically been named in the FIR and that recovery of some amount and stolen gold jewellery are to be recovered from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As per the case of the prosecution, cash amounting to Rs.70,000/-, five gold rings, one pair of gold studs had been stolen from house of the complainant and that he came to know that Paramjit Singh @ Fammi and the petitioner had committed the said theft.

During investigation, co-accused Paramjit Singh suffered a disclosure statement under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act and in pursuance thereof, he had already got recovered the amount of Rs.30,000/- and that he also disclosed that the amount of Rs.20,000/- and gold jewellery had been taken away by the petitioner.

Keeping in view the fact that recovery of cash amount and gold jewellery are to be recovered from the petitioner, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

20.05.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No