

2024:PHHC:048561

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M-7107-2024
Date of decision : 09.04.2024

Mangat Ram Saini Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. While issuing notice of motion on 09.02.2024, following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.200 dated 25.11.2023 registered under Sections 406/420 IPC at Police Station Majitha, District Police Amritsar Rural, petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that from the allegations levelled in the FIR, it is evident that the criminal prosecution has been resorted to for a money dispute. He further refers to vernacular of the FIR to submit that as per the same occurrence is of 15.02.2019 whereas in the complaint filed on 21.04.2023, the precise allegation is that the occurrence is of one year ago.

Notice of motion for 09.04.2024.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

2024:PHHC:048561

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, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gurnam Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 09.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of above, the interim order dated 09.02.2024 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

2024:PHHC:048561

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

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

09.04.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No