

206-A

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.3910 of 2018

Date of Decision: 28.03.2018

HARJINDER SINGH @ HARINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Satinder Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Munish Raj, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

On 30.01.2018, following order was passed by this
Court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon pendency of CRM-M No.3205 of 2018 titled Paramjit Kaur versus State of Punjab to contend that while recording the FIR, the alleged complicity of the petitioner was to the effect that on 25.12.2017, petitioner along with Paramjit Kaur and Bachan Singh told the deceased to accept Rs.2-3 lacs, otherwise, he will not get anything for want of proof.

Notice of motion for 28.03.2018.

In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation

on 04.02.2018 at 11.00 A.M. and in the event of his arrest, he shall be enlarged on ad interim bail, subject to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer. However, petitioner shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender his passport (if any) to the Investigating Officer.”

In compliance to the aforesaid order, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Satnam Singh admitted the aforesaid fact and stated that the petitioner is no more required in any further investigation of the case.

However, learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer made by petitioner for the grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that filing of representation dated 17.12.2017 by Ranjit Singh, a Panchayat was held in the village in which the petitioner along with others duly admitted the liability.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that the complicity of the petitioner would be debatable in the context of allegation and requirement of offence in terms of Section 306 IPC.

In view of the above, interim order dated 30.01.2018

is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of.

March 28, 2018

Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No