



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

203

CRM-M-54349-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: April 29th, 2025

Jagjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.64 dated 16.06.2022 under Sections 420, 406, 120-B of the IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471 of the IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Bahawala, District Fazilka.

2. On 21.01.2025, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Mr. Kanwar Mehtaab Singh Jakhar, Advocate, has entered appearance on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant and filed his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record. He does not dispute that initially some compromise was indeed effected between the parties and pursuant to which, Rs.4 lakhs was handed over to the complainant. However, he submits that since the entire amount of Rs.52 lakhs has not been handed over to the complainant, the complainant is in no mood

to compromise the matter in question.

On a pointed query put to learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the remaining amount due towards the complainant had been given in cash or through some negotiable instrument, he submits that the entire amount of Rs.52 lakhs stands given to the complainant in cash.

A prayer has been made by the counsel for the complainant for dismissal of the instant petition as Rs.52 lakhs given by him to the petitioner has to be recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations, Rs.23 lakhs had been given to co-accused Gursewak Singh, by way of a negotiable instrument, who is already on bail.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 21.01.2025, 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 21.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

April 29th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No