

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-62612-2023

Date of decision : 14.03.2024

HARMANDEEP SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Mahipal S. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 13.12.2023, the following order was passed :-

Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.112 dated 05.08.2023 registered for offence punishable under Sections 420, 120-B IPC at Police Station City-I, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia submits that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR whole of the amount was paid to Sanjay Singla and Mohit Garg with whom the complainant entered into settlement and on the basis of such settlement they were granted pre-arrest bail that too on the statement made by the complainant.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. D.A.G., Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

Adjourned to 14.03.2024.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when called, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

2. Today, Ld. State Counsel on instructions from ASI Amrik 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 13.12.2023 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 14, 2024		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
	Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
	Whether reportable	: Yes/No