

229

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 33958 of 2020 (O&M)

Decided on: 26.11.2020

Ranjit Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. H.K. Brinda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0177 dated 11.09.2020, registered under Sections 323, 341, 452, 506, 148, 149 IPC (Sections 325, 458, 459 IPC added later) at Police Station Nurpur Bedi, District Rupnagar.

The operative part of the order dated 22.10.2020, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is reproduced as under:-

“...Case has been heard through video conferencing on account of COVID-19 Pandemic.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is minor and as per allegations in the FIR, he was empty handed and no act has been attributed to him. It is brought to the notice of the Court that co-accused Usha Rani and Santosh Kumari who were armed with wooden sticks, as per the FIR, have already been granted anticipatory bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 16.10.2020.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of State of Punjab.

It is not disputed that as per FIR, the petitioner was empty handed and no injury has been attributed to him.

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

The trial Court while rejecting the bail application of the petitioner, observed that that he was minor at the time of the alleged occurrence, being born on 16.1.2004. So, in case of arrest, the petitioner is directed to be released on interim bail by the Investigating Officer/SHO to his satisfaction till the next date of hearing.

In the meantime, the petitioner should join the investigation with the police well in time before the next date of hearing and he should obey the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) of Cr.P.C..

Adjourned to 26.11.2020.

The report of the I.O./SHO be also called for that date....”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 22.10.2020, the petitioner has appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Sanjiv Kumar, has not disputed the aforesaid fact and submits that the petitioner is no more required for further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 22.10.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

26.11.2020

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No