

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.18119 of 2023
Date of decision: 24th July, 2023

Jagroop Singh @ Gissa

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. A.P. Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Chandana, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.219 dated 04.12.2022 under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 341 IPC and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 17.04.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that even as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner-Jagroop Singh @ Gissa Singh was driving the

motorcycle on which Gurmeet Singh who is alleged to have fired upon the complainant side, was the pillion rider. It has been submitted that Gurmeet Singh has already been arrested. It has further been submitted that there is a history of civil litigation between the parties and a subsequent FIR dated 13.04.2023 has been registered against the complainant side, wherein two nephews of the present petitioner have been seriously injured. It has been submitted that under the circumstances, the petitioner has been falsely implicated. It has been contended that there is no other case pending against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is willing to join investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by this Court.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 17.04.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Lakhwinder Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 17.04.2023 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid

down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 24, 2023
rps

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