

[202] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43700-2023
Date of Decision :21.12.2023

Ramanpreet Singh ...Petitioner

versus

State of PunjabRespondent

Coram : **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

Present : Mr. G.S. Randhawa, Advocate for
Mr. Jagdish Singh Mahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit Singh Cheema, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sarbjit Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

[1] On 02.09.2023, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ Present: Mr. Jagdish Singh Mahal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.82 dated 25.07.2023, registered under Sections 451, 323, 324, 34 IPC, at Police Station Sultanwind, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that there is a delay of 14 days in lodging the present FIR, inasmuch as, the alleged occurrence took place on 11.07.2023, whereas the FIR was registered on 25.07.2023; that the head injury has not been attributed to the petitioner and that a stick blow on the left arm and a bite on left hand of the complainant had been attributed to the petitioner, which are not on a vital part.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. CL Pawar, Additional AG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

At this stage, Mr. Sarbjit Singh, Advocate appears and files power of attorney on behalf of the complainant. The same is taken on record.

Adjourned to 14.11.2023.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and if he is sought to be arrested, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

However, anticipatory bail, granted while exercising the judicial discretion, should not operate as an inroad into the statutory investigational power of the police. ”

[2] Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 02.09.2023 and is no longer required for further investigation.

[3] In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 02.09.2023, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

[4] Disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

21.12.2023
'Rajneesh'

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