

In virtual Court

CRM-M-54244-2021

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54244-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.02.2022

Sukhchain Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

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

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.172 dated 23.06.2020 under Section 420 IPC (Sections 406 & 34 IPC were added later on), registered at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 23.12.2021: -

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has wrongly been roped in the present case though, no allegation has been alleged against him in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute of the complainant, according to the allegation mentioned in the FIR, was with the father of the

petitioner namely Ranjit Singh and now in order to put unnecessary pressure, the complainant in his supplementary statement has stated that some amount was given to the petitioner but without disclosing as to how much amount and on what date. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the same, he may kindly be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the Court, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that in the FIR, it has been recorded that money was paid by the complainant to the father of the petitioner, petitioner and one property dealer though, the date and amount paid to the petitioner is not mentioned in the said FIR. Learned counsel for the respondent-State further submits that the petitioner needs to be interrogated with regard to the allegation as to whether any money was paid to him or not.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances recorded

hereinbefore, where the Investigating Agency wants to interrogate the petitioner to ascertain as to whether any amount was paid to him by the complainant or not, the purpose of investigation will be achieved in case, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and cooperate with the same...”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Amandeep Singh, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 23.12.2021 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

15.02.2022
vishnu

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No