

111 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60788-2023
Decided on : 04.12.2023

Amarjeet

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Anubhav Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.457 dated 10.09.2023 under Sections 323, 379-A, 506 and 34 IPC (Section 379-B IPC added later on) registered at Police Station City Sohna District Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that he has been falsely implicated in the instant case along with other co-accused for allegedly snatching a sum of Rs.10,000/- from the complainant after inflicting multiple injuries on him. Learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the FIR (Annexure P-1) and submitted that his false implication in the case in hand is evident from the fact that there was an unexplained delay in the lodging of the FIR and further though the police had reached the spot of occurrence, however, no statement much less any FIR was recorded by the complainant on the fateful day. Learned counsel has further submitted that

even otherwise the allegations of snatching are only against co-accused Naresh, who already stands arrested; in the circumstances, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required nor would it serve any purpose as no recovery is to be effected from him.

3. Heard learned counsel and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of FIR reveals that the petitioner was specifically named therein coupled with the fact that there were specific allegations levelled against the petitioner of having facilitated the crime in question by holding the neck of the complainant from the rear side while the co-accused Naresh snatched Rs.10,000/- from the petitioner.

5. In view of the allegations, which find reflected in the FIR coupled with the fact that the injured was also inflicted injuries on his person, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extra-ordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.12.2023
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No