

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

CRM-M-9401 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.05.2017

Rajinder Singh @ Raju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. G.S. Madaan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, 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.0098 dated 25.12.2016, registered under Sections 306, 420 and 406 of IPC, at Police Station Jodhan, District Ludhiana.

On 20.03.2017, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel contends that the deceased was involved in a FIR under NDPS Act, the trial of which was at stage of culmination. The deceased had dispute with his in-laws.

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 counsel, in the Court.

At this stage, Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate causes representation on behalf of complainant. Complainant heard in person and he states that the petitioner was named in the FIR under wrong impression carried by him.

Post again on 10.05.2017.

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 20.03.2017, 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 20.03.2017, 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.

10.05.2017
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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