

CRM-M-37546-2022 and connected case

213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37546-2022
Decided on: 12.01.2023

Surinder Singh Bajwa ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CRM-M-47456-2022

Mandeep Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate for
Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. H.S. Sitta, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
45	10.08.2022	Hajipur, District Hoshiarpur	21(1) of Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act 1957

This order shall dispose of two petitions as mentioned above. For the sake of brevity, facts have been taken from CRM-M-37546-2022.

1. The petitioner(s) apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above, have come up before this Court under Section 438 CrPC seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Vide order dated 24.08.2022, the petitioner was granted interim protection by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, which is continuing till date.
3. The State's counsel opposes the bail on the ground of illegal mining.
4. At this stage counsel for the petitioner submits that he would have no objection if this Court grants bail by imposing strict conditions. The petitioner's counsel further argued that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the

CRM-M-37546-2022 and connected case

pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.

REASONING:

5. Thus, there would be no justification to keep this bail pending waiting for the proper investigation. The petitioner was granted interim protection, and during the interregnum, there is no allegation that he had hampered the investigation, or despite being called to join the investigation, he did not appear before the investigator. Given the above, there would be no justification to discontinue the interim protection, and the same is made absolute subject to the petitioner complying with the terms of the bail order and the following additional conditions.

6. Given the nature of allegations of illegal mining, this Court is inclined to confirm interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioners shall surrender all weapons, firearms, ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from release from prison and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules.

(ii) The petitioners shall procure a smartphone and inform its IMEI number and other details to the SHO/I.O. of the Police station mentioned above. The petitioner shall always keep the phone location/GPS on the "ON" mode. Whenever the Investigating officer asks to share the location, the petitioner shall immediately do so. The petitioner shall neither clear the location history, WhatsApp chats, call logs nor format the phone without permission of the concerned SHO/I.O. This condition shall continue till the completion of the trial or closure of case, whichever is earlier.

7. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior. **It is clarified that in case the petitioner does not mend his ways and repeats the offence or indulge in criminal behaviour, then in all future matters, the concerned courts shall keep it as a factor that this court had afforded a final opportunity to the petitioner to reform and live a normal life but did not mend his ways.**

8. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour that the accused does not repeat the offence and to ensure the safety of the witnesses, victim, and their families. In Sushila Aggarwal, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions. In Sumit Mehta v. State of N.C.T. of Delhi, (2013)15 SCC 570, Para 11, Supreme Court holds that while exercising power Under Section 438 of the Code, the Court is duty-bound to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of investigation of the police. While exercising utmost restraint, the Court can impose conditions countenancing its object as permissible under the law

CRM-M-37546-2022 and connected case

to ensure an uninterrupted and unhampered investigation.In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon’ble Supreme Court holds that “The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed.”

Petitions allowed in aforesaid terms. Interim order dated 24.08.2022 is made absolute subject to strict compliance of all terms and conditions. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

12.01.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.