



*been made and entire family of the petitioner has been implicated and even brother-in-law and sister-in-law have not been spared. All the allegations levelled against the petitioner are implausible and far-fetched. Moreover, the maximum sentence provided for the offences, under which the FIR (supra) is registered, is upto 03 years. As such, the petitioner is entitled to anticipatory bail in view of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Md. Asfak Alam Vs. State of Jharkhand and another, 2023 (3) R.C.R(Criminal) 754**. It is further contended that there is no possibility of the petitioner fleeing from justice and pre-trial detention would cause irreparable loss, mental agony, embarrassment and humiliation to the petitioner as well his entire family.*

Notice of motion for 02.09.2024.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273, Arnab Manoranjan Goswami Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2021) 2 SCC 427, Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51, Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors., 2010 SCC OnLine SC 1375 and Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer.*

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of investigating/arresting officer and the petitioner shall co-operate in the investigation.

If the arresting officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the arresting officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and the trial Court shall decide the same on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law."



3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajesh Kumar, submits that in compliance of order dated 02.08.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the statement made by learned State Counsel, the order dated 02.08.2024, is made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

September 02, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No