



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

Date of Decision:- 27.05.2024

1. CRM-M-9429-2024 (O&M)

INDERJEET SINGH GILL @ INDERJIT SINGH @ INDI

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

2. CRM-M-8579-2024 (O&M)

NARINDER SINGH ALIAS MANI AND ANOTHER

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

This common order shall dispose of the above-mentioned two criminal miscellaneous petitions, as they arise out of the same FIR.

2. By way of present petitions filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:



FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
112	21.12.2023	379-B(2) and 34 IPC	Division No.4, District Commissionerate Ludhiana

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the case. He contends that the petitioners have no concern with the alleged occurrence and a false case has been planted upon them. He submits that the petitioners do not have any criminal antecedents and are ready to join investigation and as such, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report/short reply submitted by State has opposed the present petitions. He submits that the petitioners had snatched the vehicle and mobile phone of the complainant, while he was returning to his village. As such, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required and prayed for dismissal of the petitions.

5. Heard.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of Vijay Kumar, alleging that on 21.12.2023, at about 04:15 A.M., when he was returning to his village, one car stopped in front of his vehicle. Three persons came out from the car and snatched the key of the vehicle and mobile phone of the complainant and thereafter fled away from the spot. During the course of investigation, the CCTV cameras installed at nearby places of the crime scene were checked and it was found that the snatched vehicle i.e. white



Mahindra Bolera Pickup was followed by one I-20 car bearing No. PB-18X-1812 at various places. On the basis of the information collected from the CCTV footage, the above-said snatched Mahindra Bolera Pickup was found to be parked in vacant plot in Bharti Colony, District Ludhiana and the same was recovered and identified by the complainant. Thereafter, the petitioners were nominated in the case on 25.12.2023 on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. Consequent thereto, the police conducted raids at the houses of the accused-petitioners and found the above-said I-20 car bearing No. PB-18X-1812 from the house of petitioner-Inderjeet Singh @ Indi and later found that the same was registered in the name of petitioner-Amritpal Singh @ Fauji. However, the mobile phone of the complainant is yet to be recovered. The petitioners have been found to be actively involved in the commission of crime, so their custodial interrogation is required to unearth the *modus operandi* adopted by them in committing the crime.

7. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the present petitions are hereby dismissed.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

27.05.2024

S.Sharma(syr)

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |