

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49836-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.09.2021

Gurjant Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in General Diary No.22 dated 14.04.2019 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 427, 379-B, 148, 149 IPC (Section 325 IPC was added later on) in FIR No.73 dated 30.03.2019 under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 148, 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 16.01.2020: -

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the cross version, petitioner Gurjant Singh fired a shot with intention to kill Ranjit Singh @ Rana which struck to his

waist and all the accused persons ran away from the spot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that aforesaid Ranjit Singh @ Rana has filed a petition bearing CRM-M-28661-2019, which is also listed today, for issuance of direction to official respondents to conduct fair investigation in aforesaid FIR No. 73, in which he is one of the victim.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the affidavit of DSP, Sub Division, Attari, Amritsar (Rural), filed in CRM-M-28661-2019, wherein in para 9, it is stated that during investigation in the cross version, it is established that Gurjant Singh (petitioner herein) does not have any licensed weapon and his brother Manjit Singh is having licensed DBBL gun 12 bore and a revolver of .32 bore, which stand deposited with a gun house and at the time of occurrence, no fire arm was used by any side of the parties and no person has received any fire arm injury...”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for further investigation. It is further submitted that a period of about 01 year and 09 months has passed and there is no complaint against the petitioner that he has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kashmir Singh, has not disputed the factual position 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 16.01.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

07.09.2021

vishnu

**[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No