

CRM-M-26621-2016

-1-

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

**CRM-M-26621-2016
Date of decision-10.01.2017**

Satnam Singh and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.40 dated 15.05.2016, registered under Sections 420, 406, 506 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC') and under Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act at Police Station Kathu Nangal, Amritsar Rural.

On 04.08.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Contends that petitioners are not travel agents in fact the complainant was partner with the petitioners. However, business did not progress accordingly and compromise was arrived at between the parties whereby respective sales with mutual consent of both the parties and without any pressure were withdrawn. There is no reference of receipt of Rs.35 lacs in the compromise.

Notice of motion for 3.10.2016.

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.”*

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 04.08.2016, the petitioners have joined the investigation. The learned State counsel, submits that 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 04.08.2016, 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.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

January 10, 2017

vanita

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