

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

110

**CRM-M-51941-2023
Decided on : 18.09.2025**

Jaggi

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Section 379-B(2), 34 of IPC, in FIR No. 217 dated 05.12.2021, registered at Police Station Majitha Road, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar, during the pendency of trial.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in compliance to the order dated 21.08.2023 passed in CRM-M-25209-2023, the petitioner has already surrendered before the learned trial Court and thereafter was remanded to judicial custody. For reference, the relevant portion of the order is reproduced herebelow:

“CRM-M-25209-2023 (O&M)

Challenge is to the impugned order dated 02.09.2022 (Annexure P-3) whereby the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed offender in FIR No. 217 dated 05.12.2021 registered under Sections 379-B (2), 34 IPC, at Police Station Majitha Road, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

Present petitioner along with one Maninder Singh @ Dhanna has filed another petition bearing CRM-M-25146-2023

claiming that the matter stands compromised.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State. Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and also accepts the factum of compromise between the parties.

Before entertaining the quashing petition on the basis of compromise, this Court deems fit that the petitioner along with Maninder Singh @ Dhanna must appear before Ld. Trial Court and seek bail.

In view of the above, both the petitioner and Maninder Singh @ Dhanna are granted a week's time to appear i.e. on or before 28.08.2023 before the Ld. Trial Court and surrender. The Court is quite sanguine that in case both appears and move an application seeking admission on bail, the same shall be decided by the trial Court expeditiously in accordance with law. Adjourned to 31.08.2023."

Thereafter, petitioner filed the present petition i.e., CRM-M-51941-2023 seeking regular bail, and vide order dated 31.01.2024, was granted interim bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court by passing the following order:

" Contends that petitioner is in custody since 23.08.2023; after investigation challan has already been presented and charges were framed on 21.11.2023. Also contends that petitioner has been nominated only the basis of some misunderstanding with the complainant and reference in this regard is made to an affidavit dated 01.04.2023 (P-8).

Learned State counsel seeks time to verify the above factual position.

Posted for 13.03.2024.

In the meanwhile, petitioner be released on interim bail in the present case till the next date of hearing on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds subject to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned. "

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said interim

order was continued from time to time and there is no allegation that petitioner has ever misused the concession of interim bail granted by this Court.

4. The aforesaid contention has not been opposed by the counsel for the opposite side.

5. Considering the fact that petitioner has never misused the concession of interim bail granted by this Court, the prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 31.01.2024 passed by co-ordinate bench is made absolute. He shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing fresh bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of evidence available on record.

8. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 19,2025
rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*