

CRM-M-20234-2023 (O & M)

::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(213)

CRM-M-20234-2023 (O & M)

Date of decision: 12.07.2023

Veerpal Singh

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. S.P.S. Chakkal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.22 dated 07.04.2023 under Sections 380/457 IPC registered at Police Station Kheri Gandian District Patiala.

On 04.05.2023, the following order was passed in this case:-

“Since there is a dispute regarding the presence of the petitioner at the spot and the CCTV footage does not show the face of the petitioner, the hearing is adjourned to 12.07.2023.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of their arrest, they shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.PC:-

CRM-M-20234-2023 (O & M)

::2::

(i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the investigating officer as and when required;

(ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer;

(iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission to the Court and shall surrender his/their passport(s), if any.

The learned State Counsel is directed to file a reply in this matter on or before the next date of hearing.”

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in terms of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that though the petitioner has joined the investigation but he has not got recovered the Figo car and the LED.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As the petitioner has been named in the disclosure statement of his co-accused, merely because no recovery of the Figo car and the LED is effected, is not a reason enough to deny him the concession of anticipatory bail, moreso, when two of the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Dheeraj Kumar and Pargat Singh @ Rajat have been granted the concession of regular bail.

CRM-M-20234-2023 (O & M)

::3::

In view of the above, the interim order dated 04.05.2023 is made absolute.

However, the petitioner shall keep on joining the investigation as and when required to do so and he shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition stands disposed of.

July 12, 2023
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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