

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

**CRM-M-13284-2022
Date of decision: 06.07.2022**

Sukhjeet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shubhashish Kukreti, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail in in FIR No.01 dated 02.01.2022 registered under Sections 454, 380, 406, 427, 34 and 201 IPC (Section 201 IPC added later vide DDR No.29 dated 27.02.2022) at Police Station Nandgarh, District Bathinda.

The operative part of the order dated 01.04.2022, vide which the petitioners have been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Counsel for the petitioners has argued that initially the Additional Sessions Judge vide order dated 07.02.2022 has granted interim bail to the petitioners and directed them to join the investigation, but later the offence under Section 201 IPC was added vide DDR No.29 dated 27.02.2022, however, the second order dated 03.03.2022 (Annexure P-6) was passed by the Additional Sessions declining to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and now, a notice was issued by the Investigating Officer on 23.03.2022, directing the petitioners to join the

investigation. Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are ready to appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation.

Notice of motion.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, in pursuance to the order dated 01.04.2022, have already appeared before the SHO/Investigating Officer and have joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Mehnga Singh, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has not disputed the aforesaid facts, however, it is submitted that recovery of some of the articles, which were taken from the office of the complainant, is yet to be recovered but it is not disputed that it is a dispute regarding licence of a brick kiln, for which the complainant can always file a suit for recovery.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners, vide order dated 01.04.2022, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

06.07.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No