

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

CRM-M -36162 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.03.2017

Sandeep Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

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.108 dated 07.08.2016, registered under Sections 323, 324, 325, 326, 341, 506, 427, 148 read with Section 149 of IPC, at Police Station Balachaur, District SBS Nagar.

On 06.10.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the matter has been settled between the parties.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. B.S.Thind, AAG, Punjab has accepted notice on behalf of respondent(s)-State.

Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate has appeared and filed power of attorney on behalf of respondent No.2.

Same is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to supply the complete copy of paper book to the learned counsel for the respondents during the course of the day.

Service is complete.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant accepts the fact regarding settlement.

Adjourned to 28.02.2017.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and they shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 06.10.2016, the petitioners have joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions 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 06.10.2016, 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.

24.03.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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