



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-38521-2024

Date of decision: 21.11.2024

Sumit Rinwa

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Jagdip Singh Bhatta, 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.0142 dated 29.05.2024 under Sections 323, 341, 384, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Kharar, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. On 09.08.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the 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 a perusal of the FIR in question which has been annexed as Annexure P-1 reveals that no allegations have been levelled against the petitioner qua any threat or extortion and if at all, there is any mention about the petitioner, it is only to the extent that he was present along with co-accused Narinder Kumar, who had not only threatened and demanded ransom money from the complainant and who as per the admitted case of the



CRM-M-38521-2024

complainant himself had been handed over the ransom amount of Rs.25 lakhs. Learned counsel has submitted that thus, other than the presence of the petitioner being shown with the co-accused, there is no allegation, much less by way of a whisper, against the petitioner in the FIR in question.

On a pointed query as to whether the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, learned counsel for the petitioner has replied in the negative.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 09.08.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the last date of hearing that other than the presence of the petitioner being shown, no role had been attributed to the petitioner. Learned State counsel on further instructions, also 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 09.08.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS/438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

21.11.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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