



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.18228 of 2024
Date of decision : 14.05.2024**

Rajveer SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Saurav Kanojia, Advocate for
Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.111 dated 27.06.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 452, 323, 324, 427, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 326 of the IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Jagron, District Ludhiana, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. On 16.04.2024, the following order was passed :-

“Notice of motion for 14.05.2024.

To be heard along with CRM-M-37399-2023.

Interim order in the same terms as was passed in CRM-M-37399-2023.”

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the allegation against him is of having accompanied the main accused. He further submits that in terms of the order dated 6th of April, 2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

2024:PHHC:067339



4. Ld. State Counsel on instructions from ASI Paramjit Singh submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.
5. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 16.04.2024 is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Sections 438(2) Cr.P.C.
6. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the 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.
7. 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.
8. The petitioner shall be deemed to be in custody for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act in regard to a discovery of facts made in pursuance of information supplied by the petitioner in case the occasion arises.
9. 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.
10. Petition stands disposed off accordingly.

May 14, 2024
Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge

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