

**103**

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

CRM-M-5580-2022  
Date of decision : 10.02.2022

Harjinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present: Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kuldeep Singh Saini, Advocate for  
Mr. R.K.S. Brar, Advocate for the complainant.  
(Through Video Conferencing)

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.69 dated 05.12.2021 registered under Sections 323, 324, 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana (Rural), Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case, the complainant and the petitioner are close relatives inasmuch as daughter of the complainant is married with brother of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the parties have compromised the matter and has relied upon the compromise deed dated 11.01.2022 (Annexure P-2). A perusal of the said compromise deed would show that the complainant Ajmer Singh along with other persons have specifically stated that they have no objection in case the present FIR is quashed. A further perusal of the said compromise

would also show that the petitioner party would be bound by the decision of the civil court and to implement the same. The factum with respect to the compromise has already been noticed in the order dated 02.02.2022 vide which, the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner has been rejected. It is argued that the petitioner is 63 years of age and is not involved in any other case. It is further argued that co-accused of the petitioner namely Navjot Singh has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 01.02.2022 passed in CRM-M-3906-2022.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the State and has submitted that he is fully prepared to argue the matter and assist this Court. He has opposed the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and has submitted that it is the petitioner who has caused injuries as mentioned in the FIR.

Learned counsel for the complainant has reiterated the fact that the matter has been compromised and he has no objection in case the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is allowed.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper book.

It is not in dispute that the matter has been compromised between the parties and a detailed compromise deed dated 11.01.2022 has been annexed as Annexure P-2 along with the present petition, as per which the complainant party has specifically stated that they have no objection in case the present FIR is quashed. It is the case of the parties that the petitioner

and the complainant are related to each other and the daughter of the complainant is married to brother of the petitioner, and even the civil litigation pending between the parties, has been compromised. The parties are stated to be in the process of filing a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR on the basis of said compromise. The co-accused of the petitioner namely Navjot Singh has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 01.02.2022 passed in CRM-M-3906-2022. The petitioner is stated to be not involved in any other case.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition for anticipatory bail is allowed and in the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting / Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C.

It is made clear, in case, the petitioner fails to join the investigation or does not cooperate with the investigation, then the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

**10.02.2022***Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No****Whether reportable:- Yes/No**