



CRM-M-42181-2024

1

220 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42181-2024
Date of decision: 21.10.2024

Tarsem Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner-Tarsem Singh has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.131, dated 07.08.2024, under Section 304, 61(2) and 126(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar City Fazilka, District Fazilka.

2. As per facts of the case, Gurjit Singh complainant gave a statement to the police that he is auto rickshaw driver. On 05.08.2024, he came to City Fazilka for picking his passenger in auto rickshaw. At about 2.30 P.M. after stopping his auto, he was watching his mobile phone. On this, two person motorcycle HF Deluxe No.PB-22V-7436 came and told him to carry passenger who was handicapped, to village Rampura and fare was settled as Rs. 70/-. Said handicapped person sat in his auto rickshaw and he started towards village Rampura. Thereafter, he was taken towards western side of river bank. He had gone about 1-1/2 kilometers and when they reached



motorcyclists came on the spot. They encircled him and snatched his mobile phone, his wallet containing cash of Rs. 1200/- and fled away. He strongly suspected Beant Singh @ Laden, Tarsem Singh, Harman Singh, Gujjar and Akashdeep Singh for committing the said incident of snatching.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Complainant has concocted a false story. There is delay of two days in lodging of the FIR. There is no eye witness to the said occurrence. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation, therefore, his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed confirming the allegations. It is pointed out that one more FIR was registered against present petitioner under the NDPS Act. Petitioner is required to join the investigation and recovery is to be effected.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Present petitioner is named by the complainant. Investigation is at initial stage. It is rightly pointed out by learned counsel representing State that petitioner is required to join the investigation and recovery is yet to be effected.

6. Considering the nature of offence and increasing trend in the snatching incidents, I do not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

21.10.2024
monika