

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

Criminal Misc.No.M-20496 of 2015

Date of Decision: August 10, 2015

Sandeep Singh & Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.Lalit Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr.K.S.Pannu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Surjit Singh Swaich, Advocate,
for the informant.

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)

Vide order dated 26.06.2015, the petition was dismissed as withdrawn qua petitioner Nos. 1 and 2, namely, Sandeep Singh and Ranjit Singh.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition qua Karamjit Singh (petitioner No.7) with liberty to appear before learned Area Judicial Magistrate and seek bail in accordance with law qua him (petitioner No.7).

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant have no objection to the above-said prayer.

Dismissed as withdrawn qua petitioner No.7-Karamjit Singh with liberty to Karamjit Singh to appear before learned Area Judicial Magistrate and seek bail in accordance with law.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that Sukhdev Singh (petitioner No.5) was arrested before passing of the interim directions by this Court and was granted regular bail by this Court and as such, the present petition qua him has been rendered infructuous.

Ordered accordingly.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Darbara Singh, Police Station, Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran, submits that Nirmal Singh (petitioner No.3), Gurmeet Singh (petitioner No.4), Khushpreet Singh (petitioner No.6), Malkiat Singh (petitioner No.8), Jarmanjit Singh (petitioner No.9) and Bhajan Kaur (petitioner No.10) have joined the investigation and no more required for custodial interrogation in the present case.

Learned counsel for the informant submits that the Innova car used during the course of the commission of the offences has been recovered from petitioner No.4, Gurmeet Singh, and as such, he should not be granted the concession of the anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Darbara Singh, submits that this aspect was investigated/ inquired into and it was found that the alleged Innova car used during the commission of the crime belonged to some other

person than Gurmeet Singh(petitioner No.4).

In view of the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, the present petition is allowed. The interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 26.06.2015 whereby ad-interim bail was granted to the petitioners Nos.3 to 10 are made absolute except Karamjit Singh (petitioner No.7) and Sukhdev Singh (petitioner No.5).

Petitioner Nos.3, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and shall abide by all the terms and conditions as laid down under Section 438(2), Cr.P.C.

Disposed of accordingly.

August 10, 2015
seema

(Naresh Kumar Sanghi)
Judge