



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-18194-2024
Date of decision : 23.05.2024

Manjeet Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. While issuing notice of motion on 10.04.2024, following order was passed:-

“Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement made by one Rajbir son of Pala Ram who was found to be in possession of 2.15 Kg of Ganja which is intermediate in nature and further submits that the petitioner has no prior antecedents of being involved in the offence punishable under Sections 20(b), 27-A (Act No.61) of NDPS Act, 1985.

Notice of motion for 23.05.2024.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG Haryana appeared 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

2024:PHHC:074718



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 SI Jaiveer Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 10.04.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of above, the interim order dated 10.04.2024 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.

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

23.05.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No