

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

CRM-M-64308-2023

Date of decision : 01.04.2024

JAGDEEP SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Sachin Ohri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Shukla, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 21.12.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.66 dated 22.11.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 325, 379- B(2), 148 and 149 of IPC (Sections 411 and 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that there is an unexplained delay of 40 days in lodging the FIR. The incident is alleged to be of 12.10.2023. FIR was got registered on 22.11.2023 and the allegation against the petitioner is of having snatched the gold chain. The allegation with respect to causing injury by datar is on co-accused Lovedeep Singh and not on the petitioner.

Notice of motion for 01.04.2024.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

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 Harbans 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 21.12.2023 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.

April 01, 2024
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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