

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207-4

CRM-M-48562-2023

Date of decision: 09.11.2023

Inderjit Singh

.....Petitioner

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 petitioner.

Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is 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 03.10.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that the petitioner, who is a member 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 petitioner would not be required, but he is still ready to join the investigation.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 03.10.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gurdeep Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and on further instructions submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner 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 petitioner 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.

7. Since it has not been disputed by the learned State counsel on instructions that the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency, this Court deems it fit to make the interim order dated 03.10.2023 absolute.

8. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 03.10.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

09.11.2023

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

Vinay

JUDGE

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