

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

214

CRM-M-50721-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.12.2022

PRABHDEEP SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. HPS Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.160 dated 13.09.2022, registered under Sections 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran.

Status report by way of an affidavit dated 30.11.2022 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police (Detective), Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, filed on behalf of the respondent-State, in the Court, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no role has been attributed to the petitioner; that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been indicted on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Rajbir Singh @ Raja, from whom one pistol 30 bore along with two live cartridges and one revolver .32 bore along with two miss cartridges were recovered and that Rajbir Singh @ Raja has already been granted the concession of regular bail.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer made in the present petition, the learned State counsel submits that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, inasmuch as, the weapons recovered from co-accused, Rajbir Singh @ Raja, were supplied by the petitioner and that the co-accused has specifically named the petitioner in his disclosure statement. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender with criminal antecedents as there are as many as 8 other cases, under NDPS and Arms Act, registered and/or pending against him.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious, specific and grave in nature. The co-accused has specifically named the petitioner in his disclosure statement. Further, as noticed above, there are as many as eight more cases registered and/or pending against the petitioner, though in some of the cases he is on bail. Thus, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is a habitual offender having brazen criminal antecedents, he does not deserve concession of the anticipatory bail. Moreover, the nature of the offences committed by the petitioner is sufficient enough to hold that if released on bail, he would again involve himself in similar crime.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

07.12.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*