

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

203

CRM-M-4586-2020

Date of decision: 05.07.2021

Kewal Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Ritesh Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

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

Petitioners-**Kewal Singh, Kesar Singh, Kulwinder Singh and Krishan Singh** have 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.145 dated 16.12.2019 registered under Sections 458, 323, 427, 506, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala.

While issuing notice of motion on 03.02.2020, this Court had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners with direction to join the investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

"Learned Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioners are alleged to have inflicted injuries to the complainant-Parminster Kaur and Swarnjit Kaur which have been declared to be simple. Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for effecting

any recovery. The petitioners are ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, D.A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Copy of the paper book has been supplied to learned State Counsel, who seeks time to complete his instructions.

Adjourned to 18.04.2020.

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

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 petitioners and learned State Counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners has, while reiterating submissions made earlier, submitted that in compliance with order dated 03.02.2020, the petitioners have joined the investigation and they may be granted anticipatory bail as their 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 petitioners do not deserve grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

However, learned State Counsel has, on instructions from SI Harbhajan Singh, acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 03.02.2020 passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined the

investigation and that their custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioners, the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required in the case and there is no material to justify the apprehension of the petitioners 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 petitioners deserve the grant of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 03.02.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioners is made absolute. However, the petitioners 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 them.

05.07.2021

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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