

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

CRM No. M-45547 of 2016.

Date of Decision: 14.02.2017.

Baljit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. SPS Sidhu, Advocate,
 for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jarnail Singh.

Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 159 dated 01.10.2015 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Moga City, District Moga.

On 21.12.2016 this Court had passed the following order:-

“Contends that the petitioner being the patwari had allegedly sanctioned the mutation on the basis of sale deed which had been forged by co-accused Gurmeet Singh. After it came to the notice of the petitioner, he moved an application to the District Collector, Moga on 29.01.2015 for entering correction in the mutation. The application was further marked to Sub Divisional Magistrate.

Ultimately, the Deputy Commissioner, Moga directed the Tehsildar to call the parties and review the mutation as per the provisions of Land Revenue Act. Thereafter, the mutation in question was cancelled and entry in this regard was made vide entry No.1597 dated 13.02.2015 much prior to filing the application by the complainant.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned State counsel, in the Court.

At this stage, Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

List again on 14.02.2017.

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 the order dated 21.12.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the

petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

In view of above, the order dated 21.12.2016 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to furnishing of bail-bonds/surety bonds by the petitioner to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

14.02.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No