

214

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

**CRM-M-36617-2023
Date of decision : 17.10.2023**

ABHISHEK

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Ishnoor Singh, Advocate

Mr. A.K. Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 31.07.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.482 dated 21.07.2022, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, 1860, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner inter alia relies upon judgement dated 24.05.2023 passed by Allahabad High Court to submit that now the Allahabad High Court has held that a juvenile can also maintain pre-arrest bail and the application moved by the petitioner has been rejected merely on the ground that pre-arrest bail on behalf of juvenile is not maintainable.

Notice of motion for 17.10.2023.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

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 SI Ram Avtar 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 17, 2023	(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr	Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No