

205

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

CRM-M No. 40122 of 2020
Date of Decision: 06.01.2021

Jagjeet Singh @ Lucky

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

-Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Aman Dhir, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

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

Petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.121 dated 18.09.2020 registered under Sections 307, 324, 34, 120-B IPC (Offence under Section 307 IPC was deleted and offence under Sections 325, 326 IPC was added through GD No.40 dated 17.11.2020) at Police Station Bariwala, District Shri Muktsar Sahib.

On 03.12.2020, following order was passed:-

“Present petitioner namely, Jagjeet Singh

@ Lucky has sought the concession of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.121, dated 18.09.2020, under Sections 307, 324, 34, 120-B IPC (Section 307 IPC was deleted later on and offence under Sections 325, 326 IPC were added), Police Station Bariwala, District Shri Muktsar Sahib.

The allegations against the present petitioner are that on 17.09.2020 at about 6:30 p.m., he along with his co-accused armed with iron rod gave injuries to complainant-Dharminder Singh @ Gori.

It is contended that the injury attributed to the present petitioner is covered under Section 325 IPC, which is bailable and injury attracting the provision of Section 326 IPC is not attributed to him. It is further contended that the Id. District Judge did not appreciate the facts in the right perspective. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion for 06.01.2021.

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and has accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Copy of the paper book be supplied to learned State counsel, during the course of the day.

Learned State counsel has fairly conceded that the injury attributed to the present petitioner is of Section 325 IPC. However, he opposes the bail petition on the ground that four persons caused multiple injuries to the injured with a

common intention.

After having heard and without commenting on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation. In the event of arrest, petitioner shall be released on pre-arrest bail at the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer subject to the following conditions, as envisaged under section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

(i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

December 03, 2020

sonika

**(SANT PARKASH)
JUDGE"**

Learned State counsel submits that in compliance of order dated 03.12.2020, the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is no more required in further investigation of the case.

In view of above, order dated 03.12.2020 is hereby made absolute.

However, the petitioner shall keep on joining the

investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Officer.

January 06, 2021

Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No