

212

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

CRM-M-50428-2023
Date of decision : 29.11.2023

BALWANT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 06.10.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in DDR No.32 dated 15.09.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 323/324/148/149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (later on added Section 326 IPC) at Police Station Guruharshai, District Ferozepur in case FIR No.173 dated 02.09.2023 registered under Sections 452/323/506/34 IPC of the same Police Station, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.PC. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that it is a matter of version and cross-version in which both the sides suffered injuries. The dispute is arising out of a matrimonial discord. Petitioner is a husband who is being alleged to have caused injuries on the person of his wife.

Issue notice of motion, returnable for 29.11.2023.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab. appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer. As and when called, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from ASI Gurdeep Singh submits that the FIR as well as DDR both stands cancelled. Consequently, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no more required.
3. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 06.10.2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Sections 438(2) Cr.P.C.
4. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
5. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency to investigate into the charges against the petitioner.
6. The petitioner shall be deemed to be in custody for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act in regard to a discovery of facts made in pursuance of information supplied by the petitioner in case the occasion arises.
7. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to

move this Court for a direction under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. to arrest the accused, in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.

8. Petition stands disposed off accordingly.

November 29, 2023		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No