

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

211

**2024:PHHC:001738
CRM-M-30415-2023
Date of decision: January 09, 2024**

RANJIT SINGH @ MINTA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr.Akash Manocha, Advocate
for Mr. Gourave Bhayyia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Luthra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.7 dated 05.01.2023 for the offences under Section 452, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Vide order dated 31.10.2023, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that he has been falsely implicated in the case at hand for allegedly trespassing into the restaurant of the complainant and thereafter, destroying his property. He submits that his false implication finds credence from the fact that there has been an unexplained and abnormal delay of 5 days in reporting the occurrence in question to the police. It has been further submitted that even otherwise, it is a case of no injury and all offences except for Section 352 IPC are bailable in nature.

Learned counsel contends that prior to the registration of FIR in question, the petitioner was sought to be falsely implicated in as many as 7 other cases for offence under Section 307 IPC, however, it was a matter of record that in as many as 5 of those 7 cases, an untraced report has been filed by the investigating agency, as no substance was found in the allegations levelled. It has been further submitted that even in other 2 cases, which are pending against the petitioner, he is on bail and furthermore, they are both cases of no injury.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 31.10.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation, much less for his custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 31.10.2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

January 09, 2024

Jaspreet Kaur

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No