

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

**CRM-M-4882-2018 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 26.03.2018**

Darshan Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present: Proxy counsel for Mr. S.S. Rangi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

...

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).**

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.18, dated 05.03.2014, under Section 120-B IPC and Sections 7/8/12/13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Lahori Gate, Patiala, District Patiala.

While issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court on 06.02.2018:

*“Petitioner seeks concession of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.18 dated 05.03.2014 under Section 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 8, 12 and 13 (2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Lahori Gate, Patiala, District Patiala.*

*Counsel would submit that petitioner was granted concession of bail under Section 167(2) Cr.P.C. On 06.06.2014 itself and thereafter had been regularly appearing before the trial Court. However, petitioner was implicated in FIR No.35 dated 14.05.2017 under Section 306 IPC and*

*subsequently offence under Sections 304-B , 313, 354 C, 506, 120-B IPC having been added at Police Station Bakshiwala, District Patiala on account of daughter-in-law of the petitioner having committed suicide. At that stage, petitioner was pursuing his remedy under Section 438 Cr.P.C. and concession of anticipatory bail having been denied by the trial Court, the petitioner approached this Court and was granted anticipatory bail on 16.12.2017. It is contended that it is under such circumstances that the petitioner could not appear before the trial Court and on account of which the concession of bail has been cancelled. Counsel has also adverted to judgment dated 27.11.2017 at Annexure P-8 to assert that co-accused have already been acquitted.*

*Notice of motion, returnable for 05.03.2018.*

*In the meanwhile, it is directed that in case the petitioner puts in appearance before the trial Court within a period of 10 days from today, he would be entitled to interim bail subject to satisfaction of the trial Court.”*

It has gone uncontroverted that in pursuance to the order dated 06.02.2018, petitioner has duly put in appearance before the trial Court and furthermore, trial proceedings have culminated in the acquittal of the petitioner vide judgment dated 09.03.2018.

Under such circumstances, instant petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

**26.03.2018***harjeet***(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)  
JUDGE**

- |     |                            |        |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable?        | Yes/No |