

2024:PHHC:051453

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-202-2024
Date of decision : 15.04.2024

Varinder Kumar Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Bharat Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. While issuing notice of motion on 08.01.2024, following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.0020 dated 14.02.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professional (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Kartapur, District Jalandhar Rural, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* relies upon order dated 06.12.2023 passed in CRM-M-47974-2023, whereby co-accused Bakshi Ram has been granted pre-arrest bail.

Notice of motion for 15.04.2024.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to

2024:PHHC:051453

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, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Lahwinderjit Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 08.01.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of above, the interim order dated 08.01.2024 passed by this Court is made 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 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, 1872 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

2024:PHHC:051453

inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.

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

9. Disposed off accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

15.04.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No