



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.44838 of 2024
Date of decision: 9th December, 2024

Lovepreet Singh
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. G.S. Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.149 dated 26.07.2024 under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 118(2), 3(5) of the BNS, registered at Police Station Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 10.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by 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 it is a case of version and cross-version, in which both the sides received injuries at the hands of each other. It has been further submitted that the petitioner has been attributed two injuries-one on the right knee of the

father of the complainant, Om Parkash, which was declared to be grievous injury, and the second injury attributed to the petitioner is with a datar above the right ear of the complainant, however, the doctor opined it to be doubtful. It has been further argued by the learned counsel that there is an inordinate and abnormal delay of two months in the lodging o the FIR in question, which further lends credence to a fabricated and exaggerated version having been brought forth against the petitioner, more so when it is a matter of record that in the occurrence in question, the petitioner's father was also inflicted as many as six injuries including injuries on his head. In support, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to GD No.14 dated 31.07.2024 (Annexure P-2), wherein the said fact stands reflected.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in order dated 10.09.2024, name of father of the complainant has been wrongly noted as ‘Om Parkash’ instead of ‘Onkar Singh’. He further submits that in compliance of the order dated 10.09.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Joginder 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.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 10.09.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid

down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

December 9, 2024
rps

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