

217-2

2024:PHHC:045766

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

CRM-M-2448-2024

Date of decision : 04.04.2024

SABNAM BEGAM

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.K. Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 18.01.2024, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.305, dated 21.10.2022, registered for offences punishable under Sections 21(c)/29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 201 IPC at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre- arrest bail.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure of Yakub Khan who stands admitted to regular bail and the petitioner will be similarly situated to Anayat Khan who got interim protection by this Court vide order dated 22.12.2023 passed in CRM-M-65155-2023.

Issue notice of motion, returnable for 04.04.2024.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

To be heard along with CRM-M-65155-2023.

Interim order in the same terms as in CRM-M-65155-2023.”

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from SI Rajender 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 18.01.2024 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 04, 2024
Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge

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