

217

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

**CRM-M-31505-2023
Date of decision : 31.10.2023**

PARVEEN

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 31.07.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.340 dated 11.06.2023 registered under Sections 148/149/285/323/452/506 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on) & Section 25 (1-B) (a) of Arms Act at Police Station Pataudi, District Gurugram, petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no role attributed to the petitioner and the recovery affected is also merely a *danda*.

Learned State counsel is not in a position to dispute the aforementioned factual assertions based on record.

Adjourned to 31.10.2023.

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. “

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from ASI Ajmer Singh 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 31.07.2023 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.

October 31, 2023	(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr	Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
---------------------------	---	--------

Whether reportable	:	Yes/No
--------------------	---	--------