

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

204

CRM-M-1468-2020

Date of decision: 16.07.2021

Rajesh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

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

The petitioner has filed the present 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.0001 dated 01.01.2020 registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 at Police Station I.M.T. Rohtak, District Rohtak.

While issuing notice of motion on 15.01.2020, this Court had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

"Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the the petitioner has been falsely implicated. The name of the petitioner has been mentioned by secret informer. The petitioner was not arrested on the spot and nothing was recovered from him. The vehicles which were apprehended by the police do not belong to the petitioner.

The allegation that the co-accused have collected the alleged liquor from petitioner is a debatable issue. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Copy of the paper book has been supplied to the learned State Counsel, who seeks time to complete his instructions.

Adjourned to 28.02.2020.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail by the arresting officer/investigating officer on furnishing of bail bonds by him to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/investigating officer. The petitioner shall comply with the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. failing which he shall not be entitled to the protection of interim bail allowed to him."

The petition has been opposed by the learned State Counsel. However, no reply has been filed by the respondent-State.

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

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has, while reiterating submissions made earlier, submitted that in compliance with order dated 15.01.2020 the petitioner has joined the investigation and he may be granted anticipatory bail as his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

On the other hand, 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 Surrender, acknowledged that in compliance with order dated

15.01.2020 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and that his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

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 tampering 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.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and order dated 15.01.2020 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 comply with the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) (i) to (iii) of the Cr.P.C. In view of Section 438(2)(iv) read with Section 437(3)(b) of the Cr.P.C. anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall also be subject to the condition that he shall not commit any similar offence under the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 after his release on anticipatory bail. In case of non-compliance of the above-said conditions, the petitioner shall not be entitled to the protection of anticipatory bail allowed to him.

16.07.2021

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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