

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

217

**CRM-M-53549-2019
Decided on : 11.10.2021**

Karanvir Singh @ Karanbir Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab
assisted by SI Madhu Bala.

Mr. Harish Goyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, in case FIR No. 206, dated 20.11.2019, under Sections 323, 341, 354, 294, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.3, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

Learned Sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 16th December, 2019, petitioner has joined investigation and has cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Madhu Bala, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation. He has invited the attention of this Court to the reply filed by the State in the Registry, in compliance to the order dated 08.09.2021, of this Court, by

way of affidavit of Gurpreet Singh Bhullar, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana. He has submitted that an inquiry was conducted by the Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Ludhiana, subsequent to a complaint made by the complainant and it was found that there was no substance in the allegations levelled in the said complaint. Learned State counsel has further submitted that during inquiry it was found that even the PDF was not circulated by the petitioner, as had been alleged by the complainant in her complaint.

Learned State counsel on instructions has thus apprised the Court that in the given facts and circumstances of the case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required by the investigating agency.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has, however, opposed the submissions made by learned Sr. counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that the petitioner has been indulging in character assassination of the complainant.

On a pointed query put to learned State counsel, he on instructions has apprised the Court that an inquiry was also conducted in the said regard, however, no substance was found therein.

Heard.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 16th December, 2019, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

October 11, 2021

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No