

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

CRM-M-34583-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.12.2016

Gurjant Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Karanjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Manjeet Kaur, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in DDR No.14 dated 14.02.2015, under Sections 307, 336, 506 and 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, 'the IPC') and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, in FIR No.33 dated 11.02.2015, registered under Sections 307, 382, 379, 344 and 148 read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Kamboh, Distt. Amritsar.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in pursuance of order dated 28.09.2016, the petitioners have joined the investigation. Further states that a compromise has been reached between the parties.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2, admits the factum of compromise.

On 28.09.2016, the following order was passed:-

ATUL SETHI
2016.12.20 17:51
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

“Learned counsel contends that compromise has been entered into between the parties.

Notice of motion for 16.11.2016.

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

- 1. That they shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- 2. That they 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 they shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”*

Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that in pursuance of the order passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined the investigation and they are 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 28.09.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

19.12.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable : Yes No