



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

104

CRM-M-4570-2025

Date of decision: 27th January, 2025

Surjit Singh @ Sittu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. G.S. Simble, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 99 dated 18.11.2024 registered under Sections 304(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), at Police Station Mohkampura Police District Police Commissionerate Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. The aforementioned FIR had been registered on the basis of statement got recorded by complainant Kishori Lal alleging that on 17.11.2024, two youths had snatched his wallet containing cash amount of Rs. 6,000-7,000/- and two gold rings weighing 08 grams, while assaulting him. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated. The accused Sahib Singh was arrested. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject offence and also took the name of



the present petitioner by further disclosing that the snatched gold rings have been retained by him. Investigation is still underway. Apprehending his arrest, the present petitioner had moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar which was dismissed vide order dated 20.01.2025.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it is argued by his counsel that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. He is earning a sum of Rs. 40,000/- per month by working as Incharge in Construction Company. He is a Sikh by religion and wears turban, whereas, as per the allegations in the FIR, two youths who were having short hair had committed the offence of snatching. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab who has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter, has submitted that keeping in view the gravity of the offence alleged as against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have snatched a wallet belonging to the complainant containing cash amount of Rs. 6,000-7,000/- as well as two gold rings. Recovery of the gold rings is yet to be effected. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for



conducting thorough investigation in the matter. Even otherwise, no extraordinary or sparing circumstance has been made out for the purpose of extending benefit of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, finding no merit to allow this petition and the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

27th January, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*

: *Yes / No*

2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*