

2025:PHHC:099598



102

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

**CRM-M-41447-2025
DECIDED ON: 05.08.2025**

ARJUN SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. P.P.S. Tung, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of BNSS grant of Anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 245 dated 30.12.2023, Under Sections 379-B (2) / 341/342/506/380/323/120-B/384 IPC and under Section 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved through a compromise dated 12.05.2025 (Annexure P-2), arrived at with the intervention of respected

members of the society and they are in the process of filing a petition for quashing the FIR on the basis of said compromise. He further submits that, on the basis of the compromise, the FIR qua the other co-accused has already been quashed by this Court vide order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), passed in CRM-M-16551-2025.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. TPS Walia, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for the dismissal of the present petition, contending that the snatched mobile phone, Aadhaar Card, PAN Card, Driving Licence, along with a sum of ₹50,000/-, are yet to be recovered, and therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

3. **Analysis**

In view of the foregoing, this Court finds that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled through a compromise dated 12.05.2025 (Annexure P-2). It is also noted that the FIR against the other co-accused has already been quashed by this Court vide order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), on the basis of the said compromise.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within

a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

05.08.2025

Meenu

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