

CRM-M-27941-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27941-2022
Reserved on: 02.08.2022
Pronounced on: 23.08.2022

Jaspal Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Dushyant Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Nisha Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
166	22.05.2022	Dera Bassi, Distt. Mohali (SAS Nagar)	148, 149, 323, 324, 341, 427, 506 IPC and Section 307 IPC added later on.

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above, had come up before this Court under Section 438 CrPC seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Vide order dated 05-07-2022, the petitioner was granted interim protection, which is continuing till date.
3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.
5. Ld. counsel representing the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant oppose the bail.

REASONING:

6. There was brawl between two groups, and the petitioner is not the main accused, and his case is on lower footings than Tushar. Thus, there would be no justification to keep this bail pending waiting for the proper investigation. The petitioner was granted interim protection, and during the interregnum, there is no allegation that he had intimidated the victim or victim’s family or the witnesses or that he had hampered the investigation, or despite being called to join the investigation, he did not appear before the investigator. Given the above, there would be no justification to discontinue the

CRM-M-27941-2022

interim protection, and the same is made absolute subject to the petitioner complying with the terms of the bail order and the following additional condition.

7. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and the residence of the victim and shall also not enter within a radius of one kilometer from the victim's home till the recording of the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial.

This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458; and *Aparna Bhatt v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

8. The condition mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour that the accused does not repeat the offence and to ensure the safety of the witnesses, victim, and their families. In *Sushila Aggarwal*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions. In *Sumit Mehta v. State of N.C.T. of Delhi*, (2013)15 SCC 570, Para 11, Supreme Court holds that while exercising power Under Section 438 of the Code, the Court is duty-bound to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of investigation of the police. While exercising utmost restraint, the Court can impose conditions countenancing its object as permissible under the law to ensure an uninterrupted and unhampered investigation. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

Petition allowed in aforesaid terms. Interim order dated 05.07.2022 is made absolute subject to strict compliance of all terms and conditions. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

23.08.2022
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.