

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-53047-2019
Date of decision : 21.10.2022

Pritam Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Naveen Siwach, Advocate for
Mr.Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG, Haryana.

Ms.Santosh Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This is a first petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR no.109 dated 22.02.2018 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 379B, 427, 452, 506, 511 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Qilla Panipat.

On 15.01.2020, a coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the parties have entered into a compromise and therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be necessary, particularly when the petition bearing No.CRM-M-33802-2018 has already been filed for quashing of the FIR on the basis of the said compromise. He has further placed reliance upon Annexure P-3 whereby concession of pre-arrest bail has been extended to co-accused.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

To be heard alongwith CRM-M-33802-2018.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

January 15, 2020 ”

Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the complainant have submitted that they have compromised the matter and the petitioner along with co-accused have filed a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise i.e., CRM-M-33802-2018.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances moreso, the facts which have been noticed in the order dated 15.01.2020, and also the fact that the matter has been compromised, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 15.01.2020 is made absolute.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

October 21, 2022
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No