

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.103

CRM-M-15344-2023

Date of Decision : March 27, 2023

Sanseep Singh @ Bhundi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Karnesh Verma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.22, dated 06.03.2022 registered at Police Station Ghanaur, District Patiala, under Sections 302, 364, 34, 473 and 201 IPC.

According to the contents of the FIR, the petitioner and his co-accused killed the son of the complainant and disposed of his body.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that case under Section 302 IPC is not made out as body has still not been recovered. The petitioner was not at the place of the alleged occurrence and has nothing to do with the co-accused. He has also not been declared as a proclaimed person as yet. Thus, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

The submission cannot be accepted because a perusal of the order of the Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala shows that motorcycle of the deceased has been recovered and co-accused Sukhwinder Singh and Sukhchain Singh have been arrested on whose disclosure weapons of offence have also been recovered. Even if the petitioner has not been declared a proclaimed person, the factum of recovery of the motorcycle of the deceased and weapons of offence are sufficient to deny him the concession of anticipatory bail.

The petition has no merit and is dismissed.

March 27, 2023

Ankur

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**