

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14939-2024
Date of decision: 02.05.2024

MANINDER SINGH
....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA
....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Vikas Kumar Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Status report dated 29.04.2024 in the form of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Women Safety, Faridabad and reply dated 30.04.2024 in the form of affidavit of Commissioner of Police, Faridabad has been filed in compliance of the order dated 08.04.2024. The same is taken are record. Copies thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR as under: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
53	20.02.2024	420, 467, 468, 120-B IPC and 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Haryana Amendment Bill, 2020)	Sarai Khwaja, District Faridabad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 21.03.2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. During the course of hearing on 21.03.2024, following order had been passed: -

“2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated by the police in this case on account of some grudge as he had earlier filed petitions in this Court, i.e. CRM-M-43058-202 and CRM-M-43065-2022, both titled as ‘Maninder Singh vs. State of Haryana and others’ pertaining to the some FIR wrongly registered against the petitioner. He further contends that the petitioner is in hospitality business at Goa since 2021 and has never indulged in such crime as has been alleged by the police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that even otherwise recovery has already been effected in this case from Suraj, who has since been granted the concession of bail. He further contends that said Suraj had nominated involvement of one Sumit who was also arrested but no recovery was effected from him and the police has introduced the role of the petitioner by nominating him on the basis of alleged disclosure statement made by the said Sumit. He further contends that even the brother of the petitioner has already been nominated by the police and he has since been granted concession of interim bail vide order dated 15.03.2024 passed in CRM-M-13619-2024 ‘Tajinder Singh vs. State of Haryana’ (Annexure P-16). He further contends that the petitioner is ready to join investigation.

4. Notice of motion, returnable for 08.04.2024.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondent and prays for time to file the status report/reply in the matter. He, however, on the basis of pairavi report does not dispute the factual matrix of the case.

6. Needful be done well before the date fixed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on

interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jai Kumar informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.
6. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 21.03.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 21.03.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
7. The petition stands allowed.
8. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

02.05.2024
puneet

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |