



203

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24057-2024

Date of decision: 01.07.2024

Ranjodh Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Bhasheem Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.49 dated 16.04.2024 under Sections 376(2)(n)/313/506 of IPC registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala, Punjab.

On 14.05.2024, the following order was passed:-

'...The instant petition is preferred under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.'), seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.49 dated 16.04.2024 under Sections 376(2)(n), 313, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the complainant-prosecutrix is major and all the allegations levelled in the FIR (supra) are highly improbable and far-fetched too. Reliance is placed upon photographs attached with the present petition as Annexure P-3 and submits that the complainant-prosecutrix is seen in these pictures with daughter of the petitioner. It is further contended that the petitioner is married for the last 17 years and has three children. As far as allegations with regard to rape are concerned, no time, date or month has been mentioned.

Notice of motion for 01.07.2024.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273, Arnab Manoranjan Goswami Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2021)***



CRM-M-24057-2024

-2-

2 SCC 427, Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51, Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors., 2010 SCC OnLine SC 1375 and Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner Ranjodh Singh shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of investigating/arresting officer and the petitioner shall co-operate in the investigation.

If the arresting officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the arresting officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and the trial Court shall decide the same on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.'

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, at the very outset informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 14.05.2024 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

01.07.2024

Neha

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