

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

210

**CRM-M-50230-2019
Date of decision: 30.01.2020**

Bhag Singh Dhiman

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Mohan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "Cr.P.C") for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0147 dated 31.08.2019 registered under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula.

While issuing notice of motion on 05.12.2019, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation.

Learned State counsel has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was wrongly declared proclaimed offender in breach of the prescribed procedure. The petitioner has joined the investigation.

Nothing is to be recovered from him and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Kashmir Singh, has acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 05.12.2019 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and submitted that his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and order dated 05.12.2019 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.

30.01.2020

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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