



Sr. No.207

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

CRM-M-28983-2024
Date of decision: 23rd September 2024

SATPAL SINGH ALIAS SATPAL RAMPetitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. Balwan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Amrik Singh.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.379 dated 07.10.2021, under Section 306 read with Section 34 IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala (Annexure P-1).
2. On 19.07.2024, following order was passed by this Court:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the FIR, the only allegation against the petitioner is that the photograph of the deceased was sent on the mobile phone of the petitioner by the co-accused-Mangu Ram. However, the petitioner has not been attributed to any other role. He further contends that compromise has been executed between the parties, which has been appended with the status report (Annexure R-1) as filed in connected petition i.e. CRM-M-55033-2023. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion has already been issued vide order dated 31.05.2024.



Learned State counsel while referring to the status report filed in connected petition i.e. CRM-M-55033-2023 confirms the factum of compromise between the petitioner and the complainant. In this regard, compromise (Annexure R-1) is also appended with the status report filed in the above-said connected petition.

Adjourned to 23.09.2024.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation within 15 days and in the event of arrest, he shall be released on interim bail, to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Area Magistrate, subject to furnishing bonds/surety, and also subject to the following conditions:-

(i) That the petitioner shall further make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.

(ii) That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

(iii) That the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Trial Court/CJM concerned.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has joined the investigation in compliance of the aforesaid order dated 19.07.2024.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Amrik Singh, confirms that the petitioner has joined investigation and also contends that his further custodial interrogation is not required.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation and his further custodial interrogation is not required by the Investigating Agency and in view of the detailed reasons recorded in the order dated 19.07.2024, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 19.07.2024, granting interim bail to



the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

6. However, it is made clear that nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

7. Liberty is reserved in favour of the State/complainant to move for cancellation/recalling of the order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C., or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

8. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

23rd September 2024
simran

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