



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

CRM-M-27827-2024

Date of Decision : 22.08.2024

ANUPREET SINGH ALIAS ANU

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. G.S.Jagpal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. On 29.05.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter
extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.58 dated 02.04.2024 registered under Sections 336, 506, 386, 120-B IPC, and Sections 25/25(6), 27 (Act No.54 of 1959) of Arms Act, at Police Station Division No.6, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel contends that on the statement of one Suman Singh, FIR No.80 dated 11.03.2024 under Sections 387, 506 IPC was registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot alleging therein that the complainant had received a ransom call of `50 lakhs. In that case, petitioner was arrested and later on, allowed bail on 19.04.2024 vide Annexure P.3.

Learned counsel further contends that later on present FIR No.58 (supra) was lodged on the statement of one Sahil @ Shah , as per which he had a contract with Sharan Chatha, Jassa Chatha, Pritpal Kahlon and T.P. Kahlon for selling his songs for an amount of `70 lakhs. However, he was paid only `1,50,000/- and later on, on 01.04.2024, said complainant was informed by his parents that shots have been fired on the gate of his house. Complainant later on made supplementary statement on 17.04.2024 alleging therein that he had come to know that it is the petitioner and others, arrested in case FIR

No.125 dated 07.04.2024 under Section 307/34 IPC and Section 25/27 (Act No.54 of 1959) of Arms Act, at Police Station City Faridkot, who had fired shots at his house. Necessary GD No.22 dated 17.04.2024 at Annexure P.5 was recorded in that regard.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated; that complainant has not disclosed his source as to how he came to know that it is the petitioner and others who had fired shots at his house. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent- State.

Learned State Counsel informs that during investigation of case FIR No.125 of 2024 (supra), Karan and Harpreet were arrested, who suffered disclosure statement in which they admitted their involvement in the crime in this case and also disclosed that they were supplied pistol by the present petitioner.

Thus, it emerges, on the basis of statement made by learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Narender Kumar, that petitioner has supplied the pistol to the persons, who had fired shots at the house of the complainant as per the investigation conducted so far.

Adjourned to 22.08.2024.

Let complete status report be filed on or before the date fixed.

In the meantime, in case of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer. However, it is further directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Officer. He shall not contact any person associated with the case to dissuade him from the investigation in any manner whatsoever and nor shall leave the country without prior permission of the Court. He shall further comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by ASI Narinder Kumar, stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 29.05.2024, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

- “(i) the petitioner(s) shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;
- (ii) the petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

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

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) 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.
5. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

August 22, 2024
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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