

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

204

**CRM-M-31141-2021
Decided on : 10.11.2021**

Kewal Singh @ Nikka and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
(Through Video Conferencing)**

PRESENT: Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A. K. Kaundal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Yashpal Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 116 dated 23.06.2021 under Sections 323, 324, 427, 148 and 149 IPC, 1860 (Section 326 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

On 27.08.2021, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.116 dated 23.06.2021 registered under Sections 323/324/427/148/149 of

the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 326 of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the State, on oral instructions from SI Bhupinderjit Singh, has submitted that the injury attributed to petitioner No.1 is simple in nature and there is no injury attributed to petitioner Nos.2 and 3.

Adjourned to 10.11.2021.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail subject to furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in pursuance of the said order, the petitioners have joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present application for anticipatory bail but has reiterated the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required any further.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, moreso the fact that the injury that has been attributed to the petitioner No. 1 is simple in nature and there is no injury attributed to the petitioners No. 2 and 3, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 27.08.2021 is ordered to be made absolute.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would

proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

10th November,2021
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No