

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

CRM-M No.36851 of 2017

Date of Decision: 09.01.2018

Rajat Kalsan and another

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pardeep Singh Poonia, Advocate
for the complainant.

Sudip Ahluwalia, J. (Oral)

It is submitted by learned counsel for the State that while the petitioner has been making himself available for interrogation in terms of the earlier order, he is, however, not cooperating with the investigation in as much as he refused to give his voice sample.

In the opinion of the Court, this is not a sufficient ground in itself to seek custodial interrogation of the petitioner, as the Investigating Officer has an appropriate remedy by way of prescribed procedure for the purpose of seeking voice samples, if so required.

CRM-M No.36851 of 2017

Considering the available material in the case dairy and the fact that no actual case under the Section(s) of SC/ST Act has been lodged in the concerned police station, after passing of the earlier interim order on 29.09.2017, this Court is inclined to confirm the interim bail granted to the petitioner earlier subject to compliance of the same terms and conditions as already imposed.

Disposed off.

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

January 9, 2018
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No