

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-15363-2024
Date of decision : 27.05.2024

Hakam Singh Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. G.S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. While issuing notice of motion on 22.03.2024, following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.176 dated 19.08.2023, registered under Sections 379-B/341/323/149 IPC at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda, Punjab, petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that as per the FIR the only allegation against the petitioner is of being in company of Baljit Singh who is stated to have snatched the gold chain and the locket of the victim. He further submits that the other person who was present i.e. Chinderpal Pandit already stands admitted to pre-arrest bail.

Notice of motion for 27.05.2024.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and 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, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Resham Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 22.03.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.


3. In view of above, the interim order dated 22.03.2024 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.

2024:PHHC:076908



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. 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

27.05.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No