



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

212**CRM-M-49213-2024****Date of decision: 28.01.2025****SOURAV**

....Petitioner

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.171 dated 27.07.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Ramamandi, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.
2. On 01.10.2024, while issuing notice of motion, the following submissions were made by the learned counsel for the petitioner:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that it was on account of a past enmity between the parties a false and exaggerated version had been brought forth while registering the FIR in question which is annexed as Annexure P-I. Learned counsel submits that no doubt the petitioner has been named in the FIR In question and also been attributed two injuries on the head of the complainant with a datar, however, both the injuries allegedly sustained by the complainant at the hands of the petitioner were opined to be simple in nature. It has also been asserted by the learned counsel that there was a delay of two days in the lodging of the FIR which further hinted towards the petitioner's false implication in the present case.”

3. Thereafter, on 04.11.2024, while noticing the following submissions, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that all the injuries allegedly sustained at the hands of the petitioner had been opined to be simple in nature.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 04.11.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 04.11.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

January 28, 2025

poonam

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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