



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-31313-2024

Date of decision: 25.11.2024

Harsangeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

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.40 dated 22.06.2024 under Sections 306, 447, 506, 511 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Abohar, District Fazilka.
2. On 04.07.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had issued notice of motion:-

“Learned counsel, inter alia, contends that a perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, does not even remotely invite the mischief of the ingredients of an offence under Section 307 IPC much less fall under the definition of abetment as given in Section 107 IPC. Learned counsel has contended that even assuming for the sake of arguments that there was some dispute between the parties pertaining to their agricultural land, it was a matter of record that the

complainant side was not even in possession of the said land as the ownership vested in one Chanderkanta and others; furthermore, the father of the petitioner had since long been in cultivating possession of the land in question which finds reflected in the revenue record which have been annexed as Annexure P-2. Learned counsel submits that in the circumstances, the allegations levelled that on account of the accused party including the petitioner trespassing into the land of the deceased, he drove him to commit suicide falls flat in the face.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 08.08.2024, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail and asked to join the investigation.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 08.08.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.
5. 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.
6. In view of the above, the present appeal is allowed and interim order dated 08.08.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

25.11.2024.
anil

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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