



CRM-M-40931-2024

-1-

210

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

CRM-M-40931-2024

Decided on : 04.12.2024

Harpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAULPresent : Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.

This is the second petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.52 dated 06.07.2021 under Section 420, 411, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC registered at Police Station Tibber, District Gurdaspur.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. on 29.08.2024, 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 the previous petition filed under Section 438 Cr.PC filed by the petitioner was not pressed on account of the fact that a cancellation report had been prepared by the investigating agency. However, strangely, after two years, the investigating agency had reopened the case in question and was now seeking to arrest the petitioner, as a result of which,



he had been compelled to move the present petition. While drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR in question, learned counsel submits that as per the allegations, the only role attributed to the petitioner is of having introduced his friend – Surinder Mohan to the complainant for the purpose of sale of a truck, which was later on found to be stolen property. Learned counsel further submits that other than this, the other role attributed to the petitioner is of witnessing the agreement to sell of the truck in question.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the petitioner is involved in any other criminal case, learned counsel has replied in the negative.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 29.08.2024, petitioner has joined the investigation and cooperated with the investigating officer.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.
5. In view of the above, present petition is allowed and interim order dated 29.08.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438(2) Cr.PC/482(2) BNSS.

04.12.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No