

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CRM-M-31942-2023
Date of Decision:08.01.2024

SANJU

.....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. S.S. Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Sunil Kumar.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(ORAL)

On 06.07.2023, following order was passed:

“Inter alia contends that on the basis of information obtained from private medical practitioner Section 307 IPC was added later on in the FIR. Furthermore, he points out that even if the ingredients of Section 307 IPC, which though is highly suspect since no Government medical officer was associated, are fulfilled, even then the alleged grievous injury is stated to have been caused by another co-accused namely Vikas as per the complainant’s own version recorded in the FIR. He further points out that petitioner is a young boy of 21 years of age who is 10th pass and learning the work of motor mechanic. He further points out that co-accused as well as complainant are known to each other and there was no intent to commit any crime but it is merely a street brawl amongst friends which turned ugly and led to registration of FIR.

Notice of motion.

Learned State counsel, on advance service, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana and seeks time to file status

report.

Requisite copies of paper book be supplied to learned State Counsel during the course of day.

Post it on 18.09.2023.

In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency and subject to his reporting to the investigating officer within two weeks from today, no coercive steps qua arrest of petitioner shall be taken. In case, his arrest is required to be caused, the petitioner shall be released on bail by the Arresting Officer till the next date of hearing, on furnishing adequate personal bonds to his satisfaction. Petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”

Today learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sunil Kumar, submits that petitioner has since joined the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation.

Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, but without commenting anything further on the merits of the case order dated 06.07.2023 is hereby made absolute, whereby petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail.

However, the petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the Investigating Agency and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

08.01.2024

pry

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No