

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

CRM-M No.11724 of 2020
Date of decision: 12th May, 2020

Ravjot Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioner.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing on account of lockdown due to outbreak of pandemic COVID-19.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the State on his own.

Allegations against the petitioner Ravjot Singh in this first anticipatory bail application under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.60 dated 06.02.2020 under Sections 353, 186, 336, 506, 34 IPC and Section 27 of Arms Act pertaining to Police Station Division No.5, Ludhiana, on the complaint filed by Ajaib Singh attorney of the complainant side, are that there was civil dispute between the parties and on the fateful day i.e. 04.12.2019 the bailiff accompanied by the decree holder went to execute the warrants of possession when it is alleged that the petitioner along with his co-accused has threatened them and restrained them from getting possession of the disputed property for

which warrants of possession had been issued, leading to registration of the present case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate inter alia contends that the parties are having civil litigation and it is a non-injury case and even statement of the bailiff to support the allegations have not come about and that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner.

On behalf of the State, Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has not controverted the facts brought before this Court but has sought to stoutly oppose the grant of bail on the grounds that petitioner is instrumental in obstructing the discharge of duties by the Court appointee bailiff and therefore custodial interrogation is very much essential.

Appreciating the submissions of the two sides, admittedly parties are having civil dispute over immovable properties. Admittedly, it is a non-injury case and no specific role is attributed to the petitioner in commission of the offence. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioner behind bars and his joining the investigations would suffice the purpose. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to appear before the investigating officer within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and on his doing so the petitioner shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the arresting/investigating officer till submission of report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (challan). The

petitioner shall continue to join investigation and shall furnish an undertaking that he will abide by the conditions specified under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C. Thereafter, he will be permitted to furnish regular bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

The petition stands disposed off accordingly.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

May 12, 2020
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No