



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

252

CRA-S-2686-2023 (O&M)  
Date of decision: May 08, 2024

GURNAM SINGH DHILLON @ GURNAM SINGH

.....Appellant

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab  
with ASI Sukhjit Singh.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Through the instant appeal, the appellant is impugning the order dated 07.08.2023 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge-1, Special Court, Faridkot, vide which the first petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.88 dated 23.05.2023 under Sections 323, 506, 500 and 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and 506 IPC and Section 3(1)(s)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, registered at Police Station City Kotkapura, District Faridkot, has been dismissed.

2. After issuing notice of motion on 21.09.2023, vide order dated 07.11.2023, the appellant had been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court, with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the order dated 21.09.2023 reads as under:-

*“Learned counsel for the appellant, inter alia, contends that the instant case has been lodged in retaliation to an FIR which was registered against the husband of the complainant way back on 12.02.2022 under Sections 420, 506 of the IPC at Police Station*



*City, Kotkapura. While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR in question, it has been submitted that totally false allegations have been levelled therein that the appellant had been threatening the complainant party with dire consequences and blackmailing them by demanding Rs.4 lakh. It has been further submitted that even the alleged derogatory remarks had not been attributed to the appellant in the FIR in question.”*

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in compliance of order dated 07.11.2023, the appellant has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that in compliance of the order dated 07.11.2023, the appellant has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. It has been further submitted by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the appellant is not required for further investigation, much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed, and interim order dated 07.11.2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

**May 08, 2024**

*Jaspreet Kaur*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**

**JUDGE**

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