



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.226 of 2024
Date of decision: 15th May, 2024

Sukhpreet Singh @ Sukha

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Beant S. Seemar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.5 dated 12.01.2022 under Sections 302, 427, 148, 149, 120-B of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

2. On 08.01.2024, while issuing notice of motion, this Court noticed the following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that it was after 1½ years of the occurrence in question that the petitioner was now being sought to be implicated in the crime in question only on account of allegedly harbouring the assassins, who gunned down both the deceased on 12.01.2022. It has been further submitted that even as far as the conspiracy angle is concerned, petitioner is being implicated only on the basis of an



alleged conversation between him and one Gurdhir Singh @ Dhira that too much after the occurrence in question. It has been further submitted that the petitioner is in no manner connected with the co-accused, who allegedly gunned down both the deceased, coupled with the fact that he had no motive whatsoever to connive with them or even harbour them post the murder.”

3. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 14.02.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned State counsel, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that it was after 1 ½ years of the murder in question that he was being implicated in the case in hand and that too, only on the basis of some hearsay evidence that the petitioner had harbored the alleged assassins.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 14.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that

the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 14.02.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 15, 2024
rps

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