

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206-2&3 (I) CRM-M-10-2024
Date of Decision : January 24, 2024

NAMNEET KUMAR ALIAS MIKAL -PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB -RESPONDENT

(II) CRM-M-11-2024

RAJWINDER SINGH -PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB -RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Anshul Sharma, Advocate with
Mr. S.S. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner (in both petitions).

Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, A.A.G., Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. On 03.01.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter
extracted order, upon the instant petitions:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the
petitioners are on parity with their co-accused-Harkamal Singh,
who has been granted interim relief of pre-arrest bail by this
Court vide order dated 22.11.2023 passed in CRM-M-58779-
2023.*

Notice of motion.

*Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice
on behalf of respondent-State and waives service.*

Adjourned to 24.01.2024.

*To be heard alongwith CRM-M-58779-2023 and interim
order in the same terms.....”*

2. Today, the learned State counsel, on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned, has stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioners (in both petitions) had joined investigation and they are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 03.01.2024, as made by this Court, is made hereby absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners (in both petitions) 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. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move an appropriate application for cancellation/recall of this order, in case the petitioners (in both petitions) violate any of the conditions, as stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973, or, upon showing any other sufficient cause.

6. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

January 24, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No