



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.36139 of 2024
Date of decision: 4th November, 2024

Kawal Devgan @ Bunty
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Narender Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.115 dated 10.10.2023 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B (Sections 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Anaj Mandi, Patiala.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 30.07.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner that the alleged forged agreement dated 13.08.2022 had been prepared by the co-accused with the assistance and connivance of the petitioner, who was working as an Accountant; his laptop had been used for

fabricating and forging the documents. It has been submitted that there is no recorded bank transaction or any other transaction between the petitioner and the co-accused, which further points to his innocence in the crime in question. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation and even hand over his laptop, which was allegedly used in the commission of the crime.

On a pointed query as to whether he is involved in any other criminal case, he has replied in the negative.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 30.07.2024, 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 the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 30.07.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

November 4, 2024
rps

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