



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

CRM-M No.24551 of 2024

Date of decision: 21st August, 2024

Gurmeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.137 dated 17.04.2024 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 34, 427, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (and Sections 325 and 452 of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. On the previous date of hearing, i.e. 15.05.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that as per allegations levelled, all the accused including the petitioner travelled together armed with lethal weapons to the shop of the complainant and



thereafter, inflicted multiple injuries on his person. Learned counsel submits that however the CCTV footage, which was retrieved from the spot, showed that it was co-accused and not the petitioner, who had come out of the car armed with an iron rod, gone inside the shop of the complainant and returned after inflicting injuries upon him. Learned counsel submits that in the circumstances, even assuming for the sake of arguments the petitioner was indeed present in the car, no injury, much less inviting the mischief of Section 325 IPC, had been attributed to him. On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, he has replied in the negative. It has been further submitted that the petitioner is willing to join investigation.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 15.05.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation, however, she submits that the petitioner has not disclosed the name of the co-accused, who allegedly inflicted injuries upon the complainant.

5. Be that as it may, since the petitioner, in compliance of the order of this Court, has joined investigation, this Court thus, deems it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case. In the circumstances, the petition is



allowed and the interim order dated 15.05.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 21, 2024
rps

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