



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.8047 of 2024
Date of decision: 16th May, 2024

Karamjit Singh
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab
... Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Onkar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.
Ms. Kuljeet Kaur, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.4 dated 10.01.2024 under Sections 420, 406 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh, District Malerkotla.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 15.02.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the alleged occurrence took place on 27.07.2018, whereas the FIR in question was lodged after an inordinate delay of five years, which clearly pointed



out that it had been lodged after due deliberation. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner and the complainant were well acquainted with each other; the petitioner had purchased a harvester combine in the year 2018, for which an amount of ₹4,20,000/- was paid to the petitioner at the time of handing over the combine to the complainant and the remaining amount, which was part of the loan, was to be paid after the crops had been harvested. Learned counsel has submitted that the FIR in question has been lodged against the petitioner with an oblique motive so as to arm-twist the petitioner as it was matter of record that some complaints already stood made against the petitioner earlier on 02.10.2022 and 16.10.2022.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 15.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Narender Kumar, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 15.02.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid

down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 16, 2024
rps

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