

CRM-M-16644-2024
Decided on: 10.05.2024

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Harneet Singh Oberoi, Advocate
for the victim.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
007	27.01.2024	Phase-8, SAS Nagar (Mohali)	384, 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 7A & 12 of PC (Amendment) Act 2018

1. The petitioner, incarcerated upon his arrest in the FIR captioned above, had come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking regular bail.

2. On 22.04.2024, when the matter was listed, this Court asked the State to file response and after considering the nature of allegations and other factors, this Court granted interim bail and one of the reason of granting bail was that the petitioner had voluntarily agreed to appear before the investigator and give voice samples, which was mentioned in para 6 of the bail order.

3. Petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner had voluntarily given the voice samples in compliance of the order dated 22.04.2024 and therefore his custody would not be justified.

4. The State's counsel does not dispute the contention made by counsel for the

CRM-M-16644-2024

petitioner, but opposes the bail. Counsel for the complainant also opposes the bail.

5. Facts of the case have already been mentioned in detail in the order dated 22.04.2024.

6. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

7. Given the facts and circumstances peculiar to the case and the fact that petitioner had voluntarily given voice samples and also the period of custody which is approximately three months, there would be no justification for further pre-trial incarceration.

Petition is allowed. Detailed interim order dated 22.04.2024, is made absolute. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

10.05.2024
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.