

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

CRM-M-39737-2022

Date of decision : 20.12.2022

Subhash Chander

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present :-Mr. Vinod Kumar Kaushal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

While issuing notice of motion, following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.121 dated 04.08.2022, registered for offences punishable under Sections 384, 506 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Batala, District Gurdaspur, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has nothing to do with the 'Youtube Channel' and his father namely Vinay Kaushal, is one of the main accused.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

Mr. J.S. Gill, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant does not dispute the said fact.

List on **20.12.2022.**

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer. As and when called, the petitioners shall join the investigation. They shall abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.”

2. Today, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gurdyal Singh, submits that the petitioner has joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

4. Counsel for the petitioner reiterates that the petitioner has nothing to do so with the Channel and it is only the son of the petitioner namely Vinay Kaushal, who is one of the main accused on the basis of which the petitioner has also been nominated.

3. In view of above, the interim order dated 02.09.2022 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

4. While dictating today's order, it has been discovered that in the order dated 02.09.2022, there is a mistake in para 2 wherein word 'father' has been mentioned instead of 'son'. Accordingly, the word 'father' be read as 'son'.

5. Petition stands disposed off.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

20.12.2022
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable : No