

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARHCRM-M-12409-2023(O&M)  
Date of decision : 03.11.2023

Nirbhai Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL***Present: Mr.Keerat Dhillon, Advocate for  
Mr.Preetinder S. Ahluwalia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr.Kunal Muthreja, AAG, Punjab.

Mr.Labh Singh Sandhu, Advocate and  
Mr.Mudit Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for the complainant.**VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)**

1. This is the first petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR no.265 dated 11.11.2022 registered under Section 306 IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

2. On 15.03.2023, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegation against the petitioner is of demanding money from the husband of the complainant and as a result of that Dhaba had to be closed down. Ingredients of offence under Section 306 IPC are missing altogether, inasmuch as that there is no concerted effort on behalf of the petitioner to abet the commission of an offence under Section 306 IPC.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance upon pendency of CRM-M-1424 of 2023.*

*Notice of motion returnable on 17.04.2023.*

*To be heard along with CRM-M-1424 of 2023.*

*Interim order in the same terms as passed in CRM-M-1424  
of 2023.*

15.03.2023

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)  
JUDGE”

3.           Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in  
pursuance of the said order, the petitioner has joined the investigation.
4.           Learned State counsel, on instructions of ASI Deedar Singh,  
P.S. City Rajpura, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the  
investigation and is not required for further investigation.
5.           Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, more  
so, the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, the  
present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 15.03.2023 is made  
absolute.
6.           However, 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.
7.           Pending miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of in  
view of the abovesaid order.

(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE

November 03, 2023

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No