

Ved Parkash

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Present: Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

On 02.04.2024, the following order was passed:-

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the complainant is 35 years of age and she was a consenting party and had been in continuous relations with the petitioner without any duress or threat. Earlier also, a compromise was effected between the parties, however, the

complainant is still compelling the petitioner to meet her and demanding money from him. The petitioner has transferred certain amount through Google Pay on several occasions to the complainant. Reliance in this regard is placed upon Annexure P-2.

Notice of motion for 03.05.2024.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273, Arnab Manoranjan Goswami Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2021) 2 SCC 427, Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors., 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137 and Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigation Officer on 09.04.2024 and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of investigating/arresting officer and the petitioner shall co-operate in the investigation.*

If the arresting officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the arresting officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion by this Court and the trial Court shall decide the same on its own merits strictly in accordance with law.'

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Paramjit Singh, at the very outset informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation

and his custodial interrogation is not required.

At this stage, Mr. Rahul Rana, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant and files his memorandum of appearance which is taken on record. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 02.04.2024 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

03.05.2024
Neha

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