



CRM-M-26242-2024 (O&M)

210

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26242-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.09.2024

RAJINDER KUMAR

.. Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Deepika, Advocate for
Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

None for the complainant.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0071 dated 04.03.2024, under Sections 354-A and 506 of IPC and Sections 9 and 10 of POCSO Act, 2012 (Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of POCSO Act added later on), registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.

2. On 01.08.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhwinder Singh, has brought to the notice of the Court that challan (report under Section 173 of Cr.P.C., 1973) stands presented against the petitioner (herein) on 04.05.2024.

In this view of the matter, the petitioner is permitted to appear before the trial court on 07.08.2024 or any other date before that. On his doing so, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Court below.

Put up on 29.08.2024.”



CRM-M-26242-2024 (O&M)

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that pursuant to the above said order, the petitioner has duly appeared before the trial Court on 07.08.2024.
4. The above position is not disputed by the learned State counsel.
5. In view of above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 01.08.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the petitioner continuing to appear before the trial Court in accordance with law as also the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be interpreted as 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.
7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed off.

04.09.2024
Jasmine Kaur

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No