

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

CRM-M -25665 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.10.2016

Satgur Singh @ Guri Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.
assisted by Gurmeet Singh.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

CRM-23633-2016

By way of the present application, the petitioner seeks correction order dated 29.07.2016, whereby the learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted that four persons have already been admitted to bail whereas in fact three persons were admitted to bail, whereas, co-accused, Satnam Singh is not on bail.

Keeping in view the averments mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. The first para of order dated 29.07.2016, shall now be read as '*co-accused, Bhoop Singh, Judgepal Singh and Gursewak Singh, those who were carrying firearms as per the FIR, have been admitted to bail*'.

Main Case

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.58 dated 30.04.2016, registered under Sections 336, 506, 148 read with Section 149 of IPC and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act, at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur.

On 29.07.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Contends that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The co-accused, Bhoop Singh, Judgepal Singh and Gursewak Singh, those who were carrying firearms as per the FIR, have been admitted to bail.

Notice of motion for 05.10.2016.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the Arresting Officer, he shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

- 1.That he shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- 2.That he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and;*
- 3.That he shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”*

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 29.07.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for

custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 29.07.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

05.10.2016
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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