



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35214-2024
Date of decision:11.09.2024

Simranjit Singh @ Simran Singh @ SimmaPetitioner.

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Prince Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.
.....

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.PC,
the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-2) as
under: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
30	14.03.2024	307, 384, 506, 34 IPC and 25 and 27 of the Arms Act	Sadar Tarn Taran, Tehsil and District Tarn Taran

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the
petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated
in this case. He contends that no specific *overt act* is attributed to the
petitioner nor the petitioner is having any criminal antecedents. He



contends that the petitioner is not having any concern with the alleged transaction.

3. It is further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been wrongly named in the supplementary statement made by the complainant after more than 01 month of the registration of the FIR. He contends that even the petitioner is not clearly visible in the pen drive containing CCTV footage shown to him by the Investigating Officer. He contends that the petitioner is ready to join investigation.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel referring to the reply already submitted on 05.08.2024, and on instructions received from ASI Satnam Singh, submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the occurrence along with the other co-accused and even his name had specifically surfaced during the interrogation of the co-accused, namely Navraj Singh and Gurlal Singh. He submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the nexus. Hence, prays for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant FIR was registered on the complaint made by Jasbir Singh, stating that he was running a jewellery shop and on 27.02.2024, he received a whats-app call demanding Rs. 10 lacs as ransom and again received such calls twice a week to which he took it



as a hoax. But on 14.03.2024, at about 12.55 P.M., while he was in his shop, then two persons with muffled faces, riding motorcycle halted outside his shop and fired gun shots indiscriminately upon him and as the complainant lay down on the floor the bullets hit the wooden wall. He again received whats-app call to which he did not answer and again got message on his mobile phone with audio recording that he will not be spared next time. On his complaint, the FIR was got registered and subsequently, he made supplementary statement naming the petitioner and other two persons on the basis of CCTV footage.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the petitioner having no criminal antecedents has been falsely implicated in this case whereas, on the other hand, from the perusal of the reply filed by the State and also perusal of the disclosure statement of the co-accused already arrested, it transpires that the petitioner is specifically named to have actively participated in the crime.

7. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Dismissed.

11.09.2024
preeti

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

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