

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49072-2023

Date of decision:09.01.2024

Anjeet Singh

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. On 05.10.2023, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner and the complainant were in a live-in relationship and to this extent an agreement was also executed which has been appended as Annexure P-2 with the petition. The learned counsel would further contend that the petitioner as well as the complainant are both married individuals and both of them had not got divorced from their respective spouses. The bone of contention is that the petitioner chose to return to his wife. The learned counsel would further contend that the relationship was purely consensual between the parties.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana. Learned counsel for the State has pointed out that there is one more case against the petitioner under the Excise Act. However, he is on bail in that case.

List on 09.01.2024.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when called for. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing personal bonds with adequate surety to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the terms and conditions as specified in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”

2. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Usha Rani has stated that pursuant to the order dated 05.10.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.
3. In view of above, the interim order dated 05.10.2023 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner 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. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
6. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

January 09, 2024
Ajay

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