

201

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.32925 of 2020 (O&M)

Decided on: 09.03.2021

Baldev Singh Brar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. Rajesh Bhatheja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S. Deol, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. H.S. Deol, Advocate for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR
No.100 dated 30.09.2020, registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC at
Police Station Smalsar, District Moga.

The operative part of the order dated 15.10.2020, vide
which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is
reproduced as under:-

*“...Due to outbreak of pandemic COVID-19, the
instant case is being taken up for hearing through video
conferencing.*

Notice of motion to the respondent-State.

*Mr. Jagmohan Ghuman, DAG, Punjab puts in
appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the
respondent-State. Copy supplied.*

*Mr. APS Deol, Senior Advocate with Mr. Himmat
Singh Deol, Advocate has put in appearance of his own on
behalf of the complainant.*

On request of learned counsel for the petitioner, let

the present matter be referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

Therefore, the parties along with their respective counsel are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court within a period of one month and try to sort out the dispute.

Awaiting report, list on 17.12.2020.

In the meanwhile, no coercive means shall be adopted against the petitioner till the continuation of the mediation proceedings for facilitating the same. However, it is made clear that this direction would not be construed as bestowing upon the petitioner any right to join the investigations....”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 15.10.2020, the petitioner has appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner was not the beneficiary of the disputed sale deed and transfer deed as he is only the attesting witness.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Harnek Singh, 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 15.10.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

09.03.2021

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No