

206

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.34408 of 2020 (O&M)

Decided on: 08.11.2021

Gurdeep Singh @ Sandy

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. G.S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.30 dated 14.02.2019, registered under Sections 61/1/14 of the Excise Act, 1914 at Police Station Jamalpur, District Ludhiana.

The operative part of the order dated 18.11.2020, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is reproduced as under:-

“....Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that except the present case, the petitioner is on bail in all other cases under the Excise Act as well as Mines and Mineral Act. He submits that the marriage of the petitioner is fixed for 27.11.2020 and therefore, the petitioner be admitted on interim bail, so as to perform his marriage ceremonies.

Learned State Counsel submits that he has no intimation as regards the marriage of the petitioner.

Heard.

Be that as it may, but considering the contentions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that marriage of the petitioner is fixed for 27.11.2020, the petitioner is

admitted on interim bail till the next date of hearing to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, enabling him to perform his marriage ceremonies.

List on 14.12.2020.

Since the petitioner has filed this application at a late stage, he shall be admitted on interim bail, subject to payment of costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited by him with the Bar Association of this Court within a week from today....”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 18.11.2020, the petitioner has joined the investigation before the Investigating Officer and also deposited the costs.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Gurmeet Singh, has not disputed the aforesaid fact, however, opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases under the Excise Act.

In view of the above, considering the fact that the petitioner was granted interim bail on 18.11.2020 and thereafter, no further case has been registered against him, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 18.11.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

08.11.2021
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No