

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-2059 of 2024
DATE OF DECISION :- 30.01.2024**

Harmail Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana.

Respondent No. 2-Manjit Kaur in person.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. On 23.01.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No. 248 dated 27.10.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 323, 406, 498-A IPC at Police Station Panjokhra, District Ambala; the petitioners have preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia contends that the dispute has been settled between the parties on 19.01.2024.

Adjourned to 30.01.2024.

The petitioners are directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 25.01.2024 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal/surety

*bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioners shall join the investigation. They shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.
To be shown in the urgent cause list.”*

2. Learned State counsel on instructions from LSI Gurmeet has stated that pursuant to the order dated 23.01.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.
3. In view of above, the interim order dated 23.01.2024 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 petitioners 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 for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
6. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

30.01.2024
P.Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No