

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(Sr. No. 103)

CRM-M No. 18020 of 2023

Date of decision : 27.04.2023

Karanpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present : Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Arun Luthra, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Dinesh Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

(1) Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.0045 dated 28.02.2023 registered under Section 379 IPC (Section 411 IPC added later on) at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

(2) Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that in the night of 27.02.2023 the petitioner, along with co-accused Nishan Singh and Jashanpreet Singh, stole the complainant's car.

(3) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is 18 year old; he has no other criminal antecedents; no further recovery is required to be made from him and that the petitioner is also ready and willing to join and cooperate with the investigation.

(4) Learned State counsel opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner, along with co-accused Nishan Singh and Jashanpreet Singh, are clearly seen in the CCTV footage while stealing the complainant's car; the mechanic who helped the petitioner in getting the stolen car started is yet to be arrested; co-accused Nishan Singh and Jashanpreet Singh have specifically named the petitioner to be their accomplice and that as to whether the petitioner has indulged in other similar activities is yet to be deciphered.

(5) Learned counsel for the parties have been heard at length and with their able assistance the record of the case has also been perused.

(6) The CCTV footage produced by the State shows the petitioner and his co-accused stealing the complainant's car; after their arrest co-accused Nishan Singh and Jashanpreet Singh have specifically named the petitioner to be their third accomplice; the mechanic who allegedly helped the petitioner in the crime he is accused of is yet to be arrested and that whether the petitioner has indulged in other similar crimes also needs to be deciphered.

(7) In the light of the afore serious allegations against the petitioner and to investigate as to whether other persons are also involved in the crime the petitioner is accused of as also to find out if the petitioner is involved in other similar offences, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary and therefore, he does not deserve to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

(8) Dismissed.

(9) It is clarified that the above observations have been made only for the limited purpose of deciding the present anticipatory bail application and the same would not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.04.2023

sunil yadav

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No