



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-39818-2024

Date of decision: 19.11.2024

BALJIT SINGH

....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: - Mr. Rhythem Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Seena Sandhu, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
157	19.07.2024	420, 120-B of IPC	City Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 22.10.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such prayed for confirming the interim bail granted vide order dated 22.10.2024.

3. Learned State counsel intimates the Court that the petitioner has joined investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.



CRM-M-39818-2024

2

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. During the course of hearing on 22.10.2024, following order was passed:

“It is inter alia contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that marriage of son of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant and they had applied for getting VISA for the complainant but the same was rejected by the competent authority vide Annexure P-2. He submits that the amount of Rs.15 lakhs, as alleged in the FIR, was not deposited in the account of the petitioner nor he had received the same and is ready to join the investigation.

Per contra, learned State counsel on instructions from SI Harpreet Singh has not disputed the fact that the amount was not deposited in the account of the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that the rejection of the case of the complainant had been on account of non-furnishing of the information by the son of the petitioner. However, when confronted with the rejection report (Annexure P-2), he admitted that this fact is not mentioned therein.

List on 19.11.2024.

In the meanwhile, without commenting on the merits of the case, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and co-operate in the same. In the event of the arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.”

CRM-M-39818-2024

3

6. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 22.10.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 22.10.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
7. The petition stands allowed.
8. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)

JUDGE

19.11.2024

kanika

- i)

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No
- ii)

Whether reportable?

Yes/No