

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

206-101

CRM-M-35455-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.11.2022

Baljinder Singh @ Neeta

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate for the applicant/petitioner

Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG Punjab

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

CRM-39338-2022

The instant application has been moved for correction/amendment in the headnote of the petition wherein Section 379 IPC has been inadvertently mentioned instead of Section 379-B IPC.

Counsel for the applicant/petitioner has submitted that this error has taken place due to typographical and bona fide mistake.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction to the extent that in the headnote Section 379 IPC shall henceforth be read as Section 379-B IPC.

CRM stands disposed of.

Main case

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.124 dated 24.05.2022 under Sections 379/34 IPC registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Counsel for the petitioner states that mere allegations against the petitioner are of committing theft of RC relating to the motor cycle and tractor along with driving licence and currency notes of Rs.6200/-.

The petitioner was granted the interim protection vide order dated 10.08.2022 subject to his joining the investigation. It has been stated today before this Court that in pursuance to the said order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and nothing remains to be recovered from him.

On the other hand, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Sukhraj Singh, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation but during the course of investigation, it has transpired that he has damaged the documents stolen by him. He has also further submitted that the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation as the challan stands filed in Court on 10.08.2022.

Looking into the totality of the facts and circumstances and the fact that the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation, the order dated 10.08.2022 is made absolute.

However, the petitioner shall continue to join investigation as and when required to do so and shall abide by the terms and conditions, as laid down under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Disposed of.

10.11.2022

V.Vishal

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?

2. Whether reportable?

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No

Yes/No