

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201 (II)

CRM-M-15015-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.05.2023

HARPREET SINGH BEDI

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. G.B.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate for the complainant-respondent No.2

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

1. On 18.05.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“xx xx xx xx

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.19 dated 24.02.2022, registered at Police Station Dugri, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, District Ludhiana, under Sections 379-B, 323, 295-A, 506, 148 and 149 IPC and Section 66(E) of the Information Technology Act, 2000.

Status report dated 01.05.2022, by way of affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police (South), Ludhiana, filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is an Amritdhari Gursikh, that it is a case of version and crossversion, and that vide inquiry report dated 17.03.2022, conducted by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police, Investigation, Ludhiana, it has been found that it was Baljinder Singh Matharu, who had removed the turban of Gurpreet Singh Bedi, and that appropriate action under Section 295-A IPC had been recommended against Baljinder Singh Matharu regarding the same.

It is further submitted that it is a case of scuffle between the two parties, who are Amritdhari Gursikhs and turbans of the complainant and the petitioner came off. Moreover, co-

accused, namely Inderjit Singh and Gurjant Singh Deol alias Janta have since been granted the concession of ad interim pre-arrest bail by this Court, vide orders dated 08.04.2022 and 12.05.2022 passed in CRM-M-14884-2022 and CRM-M20038-2022.

Learned State counsel, assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, submits that at the later stage, the cross-version bearing DDR No.20 dated 04.03.2022, under Sections 295-A, 323, 324, 506, 148 and 149 IPC, has been found to be false.

Adjourned to 21.09.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation and if he is sought to be arrested, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

However, anticipatory bail, granted while exercising the judicial discretion, should not operate as an inroad into the statutory investigational power of the police. ”

2. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Dhanwant Singh affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigation agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation and a cancellation report has been prepared which shall be submitted before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the enquiry before the State Crime is pending.

5. In rebuttal, learned counsel for the petitioner relies on an affidavit filed by the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana dated 15.03.2023 in a contempt petition bearing No.COCP-2516-2022 categorically stating that a SIT was

constituted, which has cancelled the FIR. Consequent thereto, the contempt petition was also dismissed vide order dated 20.03.2023.

6. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 18.05.2022 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr. P.C

7. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigation agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

May 05, 2023
M.Kamra

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