



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-21710-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 30.07.2024

RAMAN KUMAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Parveen Moudgil, Advocate for complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-2) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
391	01.10.2023	148, 149, 323, 325, 341, 506, 307 IPC	City Narwana, District Jind

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in compliance to the order dated 10.07.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such interim bail granted to the petitioner may be confirmed.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh



has intimated that the petitioner has joined investigation and is no more required for any custodial investigation in this case nor he is required for further investigation.

4. Heard.

5. During the course of hearing on 10.07.2024, the following order was passed:-

“2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that originally the FIR (Annexure P-2) was registered against the petitioner and other co-accused for offences under Section 148, 149, 323, 325, 341 and 506 of IPC wherein the petitioner and other co-accused were since granted concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 06.12.2023 (Annexure P-4) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind, and consequent thereto, the petitioner had joined the investigation and possible recovery had been effected from him. He contends that no alleged occurrence has ever took place and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and later on after the constitution of the Medical Board, the injuries were collectively declared as dangerous to life and the offence under Section 307 of IPC was added. He submits that the petitioner had already joined investigation in the case and the possible recoveries have already been effected and now after the addition of the offence under Section 307 IPC, the petitioner and other co-accused again approached the learned trial Court wherein all other co-accused had been granted concession of anticipatory bail. After adding of offence under Section 307 IPC, the bail of the petitioner was declined only on account of the reason that he has been attributed the injury on the head of the injured which although is simple in nature. He submits that the injury attributed to the petitioner is not dangerous to life and the petitioner has already joined the investigation and the recovery of weapon has already been effected and prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail application, however, it is not disputed that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and the recovery of weapon has already been effected from him before the addition of offence under Section 307 IPC. It is also not disputed that all other co-accused has been granted concession of anticipatory bail and also the fact that the injury attributed to the petitioner is not by itself



dangerous to life.
4. *Without commenting on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days from today and in the event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.*
5. *List on 30.07.2024.”*

6. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 10.07.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 10.07.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

7. The petition stands allowed.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

30.07.2024
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No