

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103-A

CRM-M-18842-2023

Date of Decision : 18.04.2023

Simranjeet Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present : Mr. Manav Parteek Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'the Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.18 dated 27.01.2023 registered under Sections 323, 324, 427, 506, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (to which Sections 325 and 326 of the IPC were added later on) at Police Station Samrala, Police District Khanna, Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioners and private respondents had very cordial and harmonious relation prior to this FIR as petitioner No.4 used to do the business together with respondent No.2 but due to some misunderstanding between them petitioner No.4 parted his business from respondent No.2 and started working individually. The present FIR is the outcome of these sore circumstances. Even otherwise, the matter has been compromised between the parties and petition bearing CRM-M-18365-2023 for quashing of the FIR has already been filed before this Court. Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioners and their custodial interrogation is not required in the case. The petitioners are already ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Senior D.A.G., Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice seeks time to complete his instructions.

At this stage, Mr. Simranjit Singh, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 and filed his power of attorney in the Court which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 admits the factum of compromise and submits that respondent No.2 and 3 have no objection if the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case particularly the fact that the matter has already been compromised between the parties, but without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail is allowed and in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail subject to furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

It is made clear, in case the petitioners fail to join the investigation, then the State could be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to the petitioners.

18.04.2023

Kothiyl

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No