

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7488-2024
Date of decision : 24.04.2024

SAHIL SINGHPetitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Ms. Sukhveer Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Gaganbir Kaur Kahlon, Advocate and
Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 13.02.2024, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.236 dated 27.12.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 323, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC (Sections 325 and 326 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Dinanagar, District Gurdaspur, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that there is a version and cross version. In the present case, matter relates to brawl and not assault.

Notice of motion for 24.04.2024.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

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 Gurmej Singh submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation. However, counsel appearing for the complainant has eloquently opposed the bail plea.
3. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 13.02.2024 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 24, 2024
Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge

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