

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.37949 of 2023
Date of decision: 13th September, 2023

Surjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. T.S. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Add. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.46 dated 07.04.2023 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station City-1, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla, Punjab.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 04.08.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had ordered that no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is essentially a dispute of civil nature which on account of some misunderstanding has been given a criminal colour. He submits that no doubt the petitioner was a beneficiary of the agreement to sell, however, it was due to some

misunderstanding that the FIR in question came to be lodged against not only him but his entire family. It has been submitted that 03 other co-accused who are none other than his son, brother and daughter in law have since been extended the concession of interim bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.06.2023, 19.05.2023 and 16.05.2023 (Annexures P-3 to P-5). Learned counsel in particular has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure P-3 i.e. a petition filed by co-accused Gurvir Singh i.e. his son wherein the Court had referred the parties to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for exploring the possibility of an amicable settlement.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the submissions made by the counsel opposite. He submits that the dispute between the parties was pertaining to an agreement to sell, however, pursuant to the compromise effected between them, sale deed has also been executed yesterday, i.e. 12.09.2023. Learned State counsel, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the

Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petition stands allowed subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 13, 2023

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No