

Vikram Kumar @ Vikram Vs. State of Punjab

Vikram Kumar @ Vikram Vs. State of Punjab

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1060347

Court : Punjab and Haryana

Decided On : Nov-16-2012

Appellant : Vikram Kumar @ Vikram

Respondent : State of Punjab

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH Crl.

Misc.

not M-17190 of 2012(O&M) Date of Decision:16.11.2012 Vikram Kumar @ Vikram ..Petitioner versus State of Punjab ..Respondent CORAM:HON'BLE Mr.JUSTICE VIJENDER SINGH MALIK Present:- Mr.S.C.Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Amit Chaudhry, DAG Punjab.

--- VIJENDER SINGH MALIK,J(ORAL) Vikram Kumar @ Vikram, the petitioner seeks pre- arrest bail in a case registered by way of FIR No.45 dated 4.5.2012 at Police Station Khuian Sarwar, District Ferozepur, for an offence punishable under sections 379, 411, 420, 467, 468, 470, 471 and 472 IPC.

The following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner were noticed in the order dated 1.6.2012 while issuing notice of motion:- Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on receipt of a secret information that a gang is committing theft of cars and jeeps and they purchased the accidental vehicles and thereafter

they take out the engine and chasis number from the stolen vehicle and affix on the purchased Crl.

Misc.

not M-17190 of 2012 =2= vehicles.

According to him, on the information a naka was laid and an Indigo car was stopped from which Vijay Pal was arrested and the petitioner is said to have escaped along with one other person named Madan Lal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not in the car.

According to him, the petitioner Vikram Kumar has purchased the said car from Manpreet Kaur and further sold it to Madan Lal.

According to him, the police had got the car itself and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has added that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, admits that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

He, however, submits that the case is of larger proportion where engines of stolen vehicles were removed and fixed in the old vehicles and then those vehicles were sold.

It is a case where the petitioner has not been arrested at the spot.

Whether the petitioner was there in the car or not is also a disputed question.

The petitioner claims to have purchased the car from Manpreet Kaur and to have sold the same to Madan Lal.

No vehicle has been recovered from the Crl.

Misc.

not M-17190 of 2012 =3= petitioner.

In this view of the matter, without commenting on the merits of the case, I find the petitioner to be entitled to pre-arrest bail.

Consequently, the petition is allowed and order dated 1.6.2012 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute November 16,2012 (VIJENDER SINGH MALIK) Jiten JUDGE

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com