

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M No.31118 of 2023 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 01th AUGUST, 2023

Malkeet Singh @ Baba Duhi

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Mr. Anupam Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab with
SI Pawan Kumar.

* * * *

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.12 dated 22.05.2023 registered under Sections 25(8), 54, 59 of Arms Act at Police Station State Special Operation Cell, Amritsar, Punjab.

2. Status report by way of affidavit of Abhimanyu Rana, IPS, Superintendent of Police, Anti-Gangster Task Force (AGTF), Intelligence Wing, Amritsar, Punjab, has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court. The same is taken on record.

3. It is submitted by the counsel for the petitioner that the case against the petitioner is totally concocted. In fact, the police have created several cases against the petitioner even in a short span of three years. In

the present case also, the petitioner has been involved on the basis of alleged disclosure statement of the co-accused. Therefore, beside the alleged disclosure statement, there is nothing with the police even to show the involvement of the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, being instructed by SI Pawan Kumar, has submitted that the co-accused, namely, Shivam Thakur was arrested by the police and from him one pistol and four cartridges were recovered. During interrogation, the said co-accused has disclosed that he had purchased two pistols from Madhya Pradesh. Out of those, one was recovered by the police and the other was purchased by the petitioner from him. Accordingly, learned State counsel has submitted that the said pistol is to be recovered from the petitioner by the police. It is further submitted that the petitioner is having previous history of criminal activities; as well. The petitioner is facing as many as four more cases of snatching and under the Arms Act; as well.

5. In view of the above submissions made by learned State counsel, this Court does not find it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Dismissed.

01th AUGUST, 2023
'sandeep'

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

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