

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

**CRM-M No.37317 of 2023 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.12.2023**

Noorpreet Singh @ Noorpreet Singh Dhunna

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. J.S.Jaidka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. C.L.Pawar, Addl. A.G., Punjab for the respondent.

Mr. Inderpal Singh Parmar, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.95 dated 12.03.2020 (P-1), under Sections 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Division No.8, District Ludhiana.

(2) Above FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by complainant-Pardeep Kumar with the allegations that petitioner along with his co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Ravi, in connivance with each other, committed fraud with the complainant.

(3) This Court, on 20.10.2023, granted interim bail to petitioner and the order passed in the main case reads as under:-

“Learned State counsel seeks time to verify the authenticity of the representation moved by the petitioner.

Posted for 05.12.2023.

In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit him to interim bail, till the next date of hearing, on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”

(4) Learned Counsel submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioner has already joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

(5) Learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Kashmir Singh, submits that petitioner has joined investigation and as on today, his custodial interrogation is not required.

(6) On the other hand, learned Counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the prayer of petitioner. Since learned State Counsel is not asking for custodial interrogation of petitioner, therefore, the objection raised by learned Counsel for the complainant is overruled; hence, rejected.

(7) In view of above, interim order dated 20.10.2023 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(8) It is also made clear that petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

- (9) The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the present bail matter.
- (10) Disposed off accordingly.
- (11) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

December 5, 2023
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes