

105
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21784-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.05.2024

Dalip Singh
... Petitioner

Vs.

State of U.T. Chandigarh
... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Tushar Gautam, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor, U.T. Chandigarh with
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.146 dated 15.12.2023 under Sections 307, 354, 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sector 26, Chandigarh.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR (*supra*) and he has no concern whatsoever with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has been named in the FIR (*supra*) on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, while in police custody, which has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law.

3. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor, U.T. Chandigarh appears on advance notice and submits that firearm, with which co-accused inflicted serious injuries to the complainant, was purchased from the petitioner, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to find out the source of acquisition of the firearm.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the investigation is at the initial stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

6. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

02.05.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No