

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.23306 of 2023
Date of decision: 1st August, 2023

Dilbagh Singh @ Dilbag Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. P.S. Grewal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.
Mr. Amandeep S. Manaise, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.68 dated 13.04.2023 under Section 420 of the IPC registered at Police Station Dinanagar, District Gurdaspur.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 09.05.2023, 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 inter alia contends that the allegations levelled in the FIR in question that a sum of ₹15 lakhs had been given to the petitioner on

an assurance that he would get the son of the complainant employed in a government job or in the alternative send him abroad, was found to be without any substance during an inquiry carried out by the DSP concerned. In support, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the conclusion report which is part of the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1. Learned counsel submits that despite the report of the DSP not finding any substance in the allegations, the ASP had recommended the registration of a case under Section 420 of the IPC against the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other criminal case much less a case of similar nature. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 09.05.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, 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 09.05.2023 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

August 1, 2023

rps

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