

206

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.966 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 02.04.2024

Harpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present :- Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1 On 10.01.2024 the following order was passed:-

Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.141 dated 22.11.2023 registered for offence punishable under Sections 21(1) of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957 at P.S. Hariana, Hoshiarpur, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter-alia submits that there is no allegation that the petitioner was present on the spot and he is apprehending his arrest merely for the reason that he happens to be the owner of the vehicle involved.

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 02.04.2024.

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 Learned State counsel on instructions from HC Amit Kumar has stated that pursuant to the order dated 10.01.2024 the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3 In view of above, the interim order dated 10.01.2024 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 inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.

8 Petition stands disposed off.

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

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

02.04.2024
Pooja sharma-I

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No