



CRM-M-22310-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-22310-2024

Date of Decision : September 02, 2024

NAVNEET SINGH

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

-RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. On 07.05.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“Through the instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., prayer is made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.275 dated 4.11.2023 under Sections 307, 34, 386, 120-B of IPC and under Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Raduar, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is co-pedestal with Ravinder Rana @ Kallu, who has been granted regular bail by this Court vide CRM-M-18180-2024. He further submits that it is a case of no injury and no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner.

Notice of motion for 23.5.2024.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana-accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

In the meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall, however, join the investigation as and when called

**CRM-M-22310-2024****2**

for and shall also abide by the conditions specified under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. ”

2. Although the petitioner had, in deference to the order extracted hereinabove, joined the investigation, but, he did not cooperate with the investigating officer, which resulted in this Court, vide order dated 23.05.2024, directing the petitioner to cause appearance before the learned trial Court concerned and to file an application for permission to join the investigation. Moreover, the learned trial Court/Magistrate concerned was also directed to, in the event of any such application becoming preferred by the petitioner, let him join the investigation and also to call for a report from the investigating officer.

3. In deference to the order (supra), although the petitioner re-joined the investigation, however, this time again the prosecution came up with a plea that the petitioner is not cooperating in the investigation, rather, under the garb of interim relief granted by this Court vide order dated 07.05.2024, he is attempting to scuttle the investigation. Consequently, taking into account such conduct of the petitioner, this Court, vide order dated 23.07.2024, granted a last and final opportunity to the petitioner to join the investigation and to cooperate with the investigating officer, but, subject to costs of Rs.20,000/- being deposited by him with the District Legal Services Authority concerned.

4. Today, the learned counsel for the petitioner has produced before this Court an e-receipt regarding deposit of costs (supra) and he also submits that the petitioner had rejoined the investigation and fully cooperated with the investigating officer. Moreover, he also draws attention of this Court towards the disclosure statement of petitioner's co-accused Sikander (Annexure P-3), according to which, the firearm(s) used by petitioner's co-accused Sikander and Sandeep @ Lota have already been got recovered by them in pursuance of



CRM-M-22310-2024

3

their disclosure statement(s).

5. Since the petitioner has joined the investigation and the recovery of weapon(s) of offence, as per disclosure statement (supra), already been effected from petitioner's co-accused, therefore, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 07.05.2024, as made by this Court, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

“(i) the petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;

(ii) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

(iii) the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners 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. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

September 02, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No