



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-51035-2024

Date of decision: February 14th, 2025

Gurbhej Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Akamjit Singh Ahluwalia, Advocate
with Mr. S.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.28 dated 26.09.2024 under Section 7 of the P.C. Act, 1988 as amended by PC (Amendment) Act, 2018, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Range, District Faridkot.

2. Vide order dated 12.11.2024, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR in question. It has been further submitted that falsehood of the case against the petitioner is evident, as the FIR was not registered by the aggrieved person but rather by a third party who is a self-proclaimed press reporter. It has been asserted that moreover, when given the chance to participate in apprehending the petitioner, this 3rd party declined to do so. It is also submitted that no trap was set, nor was any money accepted by the petitioner; instead, it is merely an allegation of demand of bribe, which alone does not fulfill the requirements of Section 7 of the P.C. Act. Additionally, it has been argued that the petitioner, was

employed only as a Linesman and hence, lacked the authority to alter the electricity load checking report prepared by the SDO. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 12.11.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Sandeep Singh, 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 12.11.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

February 14th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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