

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-61218-2023

Date of decision : 13.03.2024

RAMAN @ RAM SINGH @ RAMA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Naveen Kumar Kuhad, Advocate for
Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Arshdeep Kaur, Advocate for the complainant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 06.12.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.46, dated 27.05.2021, registered for offences punishable under Sections 302, 326, 325, 324, 323, 427, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Saddar Rampura, District Bathinda, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* relies upon order dated 11.10.2023 passed in CRM-M-49990-2023 whereby co-accused Avtar Singh alias Tari has been granted interim bail.

Issue notice of motion, returnable for 15.01.2024.

To be heard along with CRM-M-49990-2023.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

Interim order in the same terms as in CRM-M-49990-2023.”

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from ASI Lakhwinder Singh submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

3. Without commenting on the merits of the case and in view of the aforesaid fact, order dated 06.12.2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Sections 438(2) Cr.P.C.
4. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the 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. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency to investigate into the charges against the petitioner.
6. The petitioner shall be deemed to be in custody for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act in regard to a discovery of facts made in pursuance of information supplied by the petitioner in case the occasion arises.
7. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to move this Court for a direction under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. to arrest the accused, in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.
8. Petition stands disposed off accordingly.

March 13, 2024		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No