

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

202

**CRM-M-31440-2020
Date of decision: 15.12.2020**

Karamtej Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Gazi Mohd. Umair, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "the Cr.P.C") for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.138 dated 16.08.2020 registered under Sections 308, 451 and 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, "the IPC") in Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa.

While issuing notice of motion on 07.10.2020 this Court had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation.

The petition has been opposed by the learned State Counsel in terms of reply filed by way of affidavit of Baljinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Budhlada, District Mansa in the registry which is taken on record.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner while reiterating submissions made on 07.10.2020 has submitted that in compliance with order dated 07.10.2020, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that in view of gravity of accusation, the petitioner does not deserve grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

However, learned State Counsel has, on instructions from SI Baldev Singh, acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 07.10.2020 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and that his custodial interrogation in the present case is not required for effecting any recovery.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case and there is no material to justify the apprehension of the petitioner fleeing from justice or tempering with evidence or criminally intimidating the prosecution witnesses but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the grant of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 07.10.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation again if and as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions

enumerated in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C., failing which the protection of anticipatory bail order shall not be available to him.

15.12.2020

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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