



112/2

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-62598-2023(O&M)**Date of decision: 08.05.2024**

Mandeep Singh alias Sunny

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present first petition has been filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 200 dated 12.06.2023, under Section 379-B(2) read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Islamabad, District Amritsar.

(2) Above FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by complainant-Sharanjot Singh with the allegations that petitioner alongwith co-accused snatched Rs. 10 lakh from complainant by putting red chilly power in his eyes and threatened to kill him.

(3) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he has been falsely implicated in the present case and not named in the FIR. Further contends that petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused-Kawaljit Singh @ Billa and Jagjit Singh@ Sanju and no role has been attributed to him. Thus, his custodial interrogation is not required.



(4) *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer on the ground that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as there are serious and specific allegations against him. Further submits that petitioner is the main conspirator who provided information to co-accused regarding carrying of cash by complainant; thus, he does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail.

(5) Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

(6) As per short reply dated 08.01.2024 filed by learned State, para No. 7 reads as under:-

*“That during investigation, the accused Kawanjit Singh @ Billa and Jagjit Singh @ Sanju disclosed that about four days prior to committing crime in the present case, their associate namely Abhi-co-accused told them that **Sunny (nick name of present petitioner), whom they have never met with, had confirm information qua a person, who carries money with him, hence his work is to be done and they should get ready.** Thereafter, pursuant to the information given by Abhi, they both along with Abhi and Sagar@ Gandhi R/O Lal Mill had snatched bag containing Rs. 10 lakhs from the complainant. Abhi had poured chilli power in eyes of the complainant. The accused-Kawaljit Singh @ Billa and Jagjit Singh @ Sanju were riding on Splendor motorcycle without number and Abhi and Sagar @ Gandhi were riding on a separate motorcycle. The accused Kawaljit Singh @ Billa and Abhi were having sickles and caused injuries to the complainant with their respective sickles.”*

(7) Keeping in view the seriousness of allegations and the fact that petitioner provided information *qua* movement of the complainant to other co-accused, who in turn had snatched cash amount of Rs. 10 lakhs. Therefore, custodial interrogation of petitioner is very much necessary to know the true facts. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

(8) Consequently, petition is dismissed.



- (9)

The observations made above be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the present petition.
- (10)

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

08.05.2024

Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No