

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-1401-2024
Date of decision : 03.04.2024

SARVANPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 11.01.2024, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.74 dated 29.05.2023 registered for offence punishable under Sections 21, 27(A) and Section 29 (added later on) of N.D.P.S. Act at P.S. Ghuman District Batala, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia submits that the petitioner along with co-accused Palwinder Singh have been nominated on the basis of disclosure made by Anmolpreet Singh who was apprehended and found to be in conscious possession of 50 gm of heroin. Further submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents and relies upon the judgment of Apex Court in **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1.**

Notice of motion

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

Adjourned to 03.04.2024.

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 Gurmeet Sing submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.
3. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 11.01.2024 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.

April 03, 2024
Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge

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