

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.202

CRM-M-19506-2022

Date of decision: 13.09.2022

Sarabjit Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. G.S. Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Navneet Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.28 dated 27.05.2018 registered under Sections 406, 417 and 498-A IPC at Women Police Station, Amritsar, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

On 09.05.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case being father-in-law of the complainant; he has no other criminal case pending against him; after investigation, the petitioner had at an earlier point of time been declared innocent; the petitioner had voluntarily joined and cooperated with the investigation in terms of the directions by the trial Court; the matter in dispute between the petitioner's son and the complainant already stands amicably resolved and that the petitioner is also ready and willing to join and cooperate with the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Gunkirat Kaur, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

For arguments, adjourned to 13.09.2022.

In the meanwhile subject to the petitioner's joining investigation as and when called by the investigating agency as

also abiding by the other conditions provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C, in the event of his arrest in FIR No.28 dated 27.5.2018 registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC (Section 417 IPC added later on) at Police Station Women, Amritsar, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar, he shall be released on ad interim anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the passing of the afore-quoted order, the petitioner and the complainant have compromised the matter.

Learned State counsel submits that under the afore-quoted order passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation; co-operated with the investigating agency and that his custodial interrogation is not required by the State.

In view of the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner in the afore-quoted order; the statement made on behalf of the State that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and that the petitioner and the complainant have compromised the matter, the interim order of this Court dated 09.05.2022, granting ad interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is ordered to be made absolute.

September 13, 2022
Jyoti 1

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No