

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

CRM-M-6880 of 2019(O&M)

Date of Decision:14.03.2019

Lachhman Dass

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Ms. Mannat Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.L. Pawar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.(Oral)

CRM-8872 of 2019

The instant application has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for placing on record the amended memo of parties.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed subject to all just exceptions and the amended memo of parties is taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

CRM-M-6880 of 2019

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR 97 dated 22.05.2017, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Division No.4, District Ludhiana.

On 14.02.2019, the following order was passed by this Court:

“Contents that although the petitioner was granted ad-interim bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana on 16.01.2019 (P-1), but on account of some communication gap with his Counsel, he could not

appear before learned trial Court and that resulted into dismissal of his petition for seeking anticipatory bail on 04.02.2019 (P-2). Further contends that petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion for 14.03.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of his arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit him to interim bail till the next date of hearing in the present case on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner is also directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in terms of the order dated 14.02.2019, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

On instructions from ASI Sudarshan Lal, the above factual position is duly acknowledged by learned State counsel and further stated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the present case.

In view of the above, the order dated 14.02.2019 is made absolute subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off.

[MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU]
JUDGE

March 14, 2019
rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

yes/no
yes/no