



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40456-2024
Date of decision: 26.09.2024

AMRITPAL SINGH @ AMIT
.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG Punjab.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Reply dated 18.09.2024 already filed in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in cross-FIR registered vide General Diary No.50 dated 08.07.2024 under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1) 391(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023 at P.S. Chabbewal in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
60	07.07.2024	126(2), 109, 115(2), 118(1), 351(2) BNS, 2023	Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur.



-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 21.08.2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. During the course of hearing on 21.08.2024, following order had been passed: -

“ The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in cross-FIR G.D. No.50 dated 08.07.2024 registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 391(3), 190 BNS, 2023 at Police Station Chabbewal in FIR No.60 dated 07.07.2024 under Sections 126(2), 109, 115(2), 118(1), 351(2) BNS, 2023 at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that only simple injuries have been attributed to the petitioner and the injury attracting Section 109 BNS, 2023 has been attributed to co-accused Harpreet Singh. Even otherwise, it was a case of version and crossversion and it was yet to be ascertained as to which party was the aggressor side.

Notice of motion for 26.09.2024.

Ms. Ramta K Choudhary, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) Cr.P.C.:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;

ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his/her/their passport, if any.

Meanwhile, the State counsel is directed to file an affidavit as to the exact role of the petitioner along with the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.”



5. Learned State counsel on instructions received from ASI Kaushal Chander informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.
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 21.08.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 21.08.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS. 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.

26.09.2024
puneet

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |