



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-30935-2024

Date of decision: 23.10.2024

Karam Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Imaan Singh Khara, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.61 dated 29.05.2024 under Sections 324, 323, 34 of the IPC, 1860 (Section 307 of the IPC added lateron) registered at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.

2. On 17.07.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned State counsel, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“On being put to notice, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Randhir Singh, has not disputed that it is a case of version and cross version wherein injuries were sustained by both the sides at the hands of each other. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel on instructions that both the parties were medico legally examined on the date of occurrence itself and injuries were found on the person of both the parties.



CRM-M-30935-2024

On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel as to what was the nature of injury attributed to the petitioner, he, on instructions has submitted that the petitioner inflicted kahi blow on the left temple and wrist of injured complainant Kuldeep Singh and the said injuries were found to be blunt in nature. Learned State counsel on further instructions has not disputed that the injury inviting the mischief of Section 307 of the IPC has been attributed to co-accused Gurmukh Singh who inflicted a kahi blow on the head of injured Amrik Singh.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 17.07.2024, 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 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.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 17.07.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS/438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

23.10.2024

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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