

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

207-3

CRM-M-44569-2023

Date of decision: 09.11.2023

Pavittar Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Rahul Kisan, Advocate for  
Mr. Bhawesh Chaudhary, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ram Kumar Chauhan, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.30 dated 08.02.2022 for the offences under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Division No.8, District Jalandhar.
2. Reply on behalf of the complainant has been filed in the Registry which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.
3. On 06.09.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioners and asked them to join investigation:-

*“Learned counsel inter alia contends that the petitioners, who are members of the Gurudwara Parbhandak Committee, Gobindsar, Gobind Nagar, Jalandhar had been falsely implicated in the case in hand for allegedly issuing a letter to the effect that co-accused Baljit Singh and Darshan Singh, who were accused in another criminal case, were present in the Gurudwara on*

*the occasion of Guruparv on 02.11.2020. Learned counsel submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioners would not be required, but they are still ready to join the investigation. ”*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of order dated 06.09.2023, the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions from ASI Gurdeep Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation and on further instructions submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has, however, opposed the prayer made by counsel opposite for extending the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in view of the allegations levelled against them in the FIR in question.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. Since it has not been disputed by the learned State counsel on instructions that the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency, this Court deems it fit to make the interim order dated 06.09.2023 absolute.

9. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 06.09.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

09.11.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

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