



CRM-M-60640-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(221)

CRM-M-60640-2024

Date of Decision : 12.12.2024

Roban Singh @ Gorroban Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Avneet, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Navnit Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Abhishek Thakur, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. This Court, on dated 04.12.2024, had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

"1. Through this second petition cast under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, in FIR No.84 dated 10.11.2023, under Sections 379-B, 451, 506, 34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Ghanie Ke Bangar, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Petitioner's earlier anticipatory bail petition bearing No.CRM-M-62582-2023 was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 07.03.2024. The cause for dismissal of the said petition was that, the petitioner did not cooperate with the investigating officer and did not disclose the name of his co-accused.

3. Now this second petition has been filed by the petitioner and the principal argument of the learned counsel for the



petitioner is clothed in the claim that, on account of the supervening events in the shape of the matter becoming compromised between the parties, as is evident from the compromise deeds (Annexures P3 and P4), the petitioner may be granted the yearned for relief. He also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to disclose the name of his co-accused, who were accompanying him at the time of occurrence.

4. To substantiate his above made claim of compromise, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already filed a petition bearing CRM-M-15122-2024 before this Court, thereby seeking quashing of the present FIR on the basis of compromise.

5. At this stage, Mr. Navnit Sharma, Advocate, who records his appearance on behalf of the respondent No.2, under memorandum of appearance instituted before this Court today, admits the factum of compromise between the parties and extends his 'No Objection' in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail. He is directed to file a validly executed Vakalatnama in his favour by the respondent concerned on or before the subsequent date of hearing.

6. Notice of motion.

7. Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, D.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Punjab.

8. Mr. Navnit Sharma, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No.2.

9. In view of the matter admittedly becoming compromised between the parties, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and to appear before the investigating agency, as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section



482(2) of the B.N.S.S., 2023.
10. List on 12.12.2024, along with CRM-M-15122-2024.”

2. Today, the learned State counsel, on instructions imparted to her from the Investigating Officer concerned, stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for further custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 04.12.2024, is hereby made absolute, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

- “(i) the petitioner(s) shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;
- (ii) the petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;
- (iii) the petitioner(s) shall make himself/herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) 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. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

December 12, 2024
Manpreet

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