



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-44455-2024

Date of decision: 12.12.2024

Karampal Kumar alias Khabbu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.170 dated 02.08.2024 under Sections 379-B/341/34 of the IPC registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. On 09.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had issued notice of motion to the respondent:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1 was registered against four unknown youths, who allegedly snatched the mobile handset of the complainant. Learned counsel submits that strangely it is after four months of the alleged occurrence that the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused and that too on the basis of a disclosure statement suffered by one of the co-accused.”

3. Thereafter, on 25.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the State, this Court had



CRM-M-44455-2024

granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned State counsel has controverted the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused pursuant to a disclosure statement suffered by one of the co-accused. Learned State counsel has submitted that in fact, the petitioner was nominated as an accused at the very first instance when the FIR in question was registered by the complainant. It has, however, not been disputed that the FIR came to be registered after four months of the alleged occurrence. Learned State counsel has, on further instructions, submitted that the petitioner has previously been involved in a case of snatching.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 25.09.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhjinder Singh, 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.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 25.09.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

12.12.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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