



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

321

CRM-M-46487-2024

Date of Decision : **December 10, 2024**

KULDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. B.S.Mamli, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rubal Panwar, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. On 4.11.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“Status report dated 21.10.2024 by way of an affidavit of Deepinderpal Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Lehra, District Sangrur, on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

Mr. Ajay Chaudhary, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of complainant and has filed memorandum of appearance, which is taken on record. He undertakes to file his vakalatnama in the Registry.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have entered into compromise and in this regard, he has placed on record a copy of compromise deed. He further submits that he has already filed an application for placing on record the compromise deed and the same is pending before the Registry. There is version and cross-version and both the versions petition seeking quashing of the FIR have already been filed.

Adjourned to 10.12.2024.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when called by SHO/Investigating Officer and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) B.N.S:-

(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 as to dissuade him 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 concerned.”

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned, stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for further custodial interrogation and the weapon of offence has been recovered.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 4.11.2024, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

“(i) the petitioner(s) shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall make himself/herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

5. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

December 10, 2024
ajay-1

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No