

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

CRM-M -3602 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.05.2017

Nitin Verma @ Niti

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. P.S. Miglanni, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.109 dated 22.11.2016, registered under Section 379-B of IPC, at Police Station PAU, Ludhiana City, District Ludhiana.

On 13.02.2017, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel contends that alleged mobile phone of the complainant was snatched away by co-accused, namely, Anmol Arora who has been admitted to regular bail by this Court vide order dated 21.12.2016. The alleged mobile phone has also been recovered from the co-accused. The petitioner was pillion rider and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. A compromise between the main accused and complainant has been reached as

reflected in Annexure P-3. Further, petitioner is not involved in any other similar FIR.

Notice of motion for 29.03.2017.

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 order dated 13.02.2017, 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 13.02.2017, 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.

03.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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