

223

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3333-2025
Date of Decision:-13.02.2025

ASHA ALIAS SATO AND ANR

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) the petitioners are praying for anticipatory bail in the following FIR (Annexure P-1):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
432	04.12.2024	303(2) BNS, 2023	City Faridkot District Faridkot

2. Argument heard.
3. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are ladies having no concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR, nor they are involved in the alleged theft. He further contends that the petitioners being poor ladies used to go to the various areas for cutting of dry wood and have been named in the instant FIR on the basis of



the suspicion, hence prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. *On the other hand*, learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State has assailed these arguments by submitting that the petitioners along with their accomplice had stolen Aluminum plates of the complainant Army regiment and the act of the petitioners is duly captured in the CCTV installed therein, hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail petition on the ground that their custodial interrogation is required for recovery of stolen articles.

5. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it is observed that the instant FIR was registered on the basis of letter written by Major Captain of the Regiment, Army Cantonment, Faridkot with regard to theft having taken place in Engineer Store on 01.12.2024 whereby the thieves have taken one roll of ATW Class 12 Aluminum plates from the store. It was pointed out that on thorough checking of the CCTV footage it was found that petitioners alongwith their male accomplice had stolen the same.

6. Originally the FIR was registered against unknown persons, however on observance of the CCTV footage the present petitioners have been nominated vide DDR No. 46 dated 05.12.2024. As stated above, the act of the petitioners stealing the above Aluminum roll from the store of the complainant Unit of the Army stands duly captured in the CCTV installed therein, therefore, recovery of stolen articles is yet to be effected from the petitioners for which their custodial interrogation is required. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, no case is made out in



favour of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition,
the same is hereby dismissed.

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

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

13.02.2025

Gyan

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