

218

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-30801-2023
Date of decision : 07.11.2023

PALWINDER SINGH @ HAPPY

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 19.07.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.3 dated 04.01.2023 for offences punishable under Sections 22 of NDPS Act registered at Police Station Banur, District Patiala, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking pre-arrest bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement made by one Ranjeet Singh @ Bittu. He further contends that the story put forth by the prosecution is highly unbelievable as the police party was also riding a car and no effort was made to chase the petitioner. The description of the vehicle has been given to be Skoda Car but neither the colour nor the number of the car is coming forth.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Senior DAG., Punjab who is present in Court accepts notice.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer. As and when called, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. To come up on 21.09.2023.”

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from SI Mohan submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.
3. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 19.07.2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Sections 438(2) Cr.P.C.
4. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
5. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency to investigate into the charges against the petitioner.
6. The petitioner shall be deemed to be in custody for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act in regard to a discovery of facts made in pursuance of information supplied by the petitioner in case the occasion arises.
7. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to

move this Court for a direction under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. to arrest the accused, in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.

8. Petition stands disposed off accordingly.

November 07, 2023		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No