

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54973-2024
Date of decision: 05.12.2024

AMARJEET SINGH....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA....RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: - Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. Status report dated 04.12.2024 filed in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Shahabad, Kurukshetra, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Arguments heard.
3. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
516	24.09.2024	406, 420 of IPC	Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 14.11.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such prayed for confirming the interim bail granted vide order dated 14.11.2024.
5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Navtej, intimates the Court that the petitioner has joined investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.



CRM-M-54973-2024

2

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the petition on the ground that keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the petition does not deserves the concession of bail.

7. During the course of hearing on 14.11.2024, following order was passed:

“2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case on account of certain allegations against his son, namely Shamsher Singh. He contends that the petitioner had already dis-inherited his son vide Annexure P-1 dated 19.04.2022 much before registration of the instant FIR. He contends that as per the FIR there are no allegations of any assurance given by the petitioner nor any fraud committed by him and as per the FIR, the allegations are against his son. He contends that the petitioner has not received any payment in this transaction. He further contends that in the another case registered in Punjab on similar grounds, the petitioner is on bail. Hence, the instant petition seeking concession of bail.

3. Notice of motion, returnable for 05.12.2024.

4. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, DAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondent and prays for time to file the status report/reply in the matter.

5. Mr. Rajesh Malik, Advocate, has entered appearance on behalf of Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate, and filed his power of attorney to assist learned State counsel in the matter. The same is taken on record.

6. Needful be done well before the date fixed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on interim bail on his

CRM-M-54973-2024

3

furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS). ”

8. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 14.11.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 14.11.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
9. The petition stands allowed.
10. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

05.12.2024
kanika

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |