

224

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64112-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 18.02.2025

RAM SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF U.T. CHANDIGARH AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. U.T., Chandigarh with
Mr. Rajiv Vij, Addl. P.P, U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Sumit Saddi, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 BNSS,
petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
76	13.09.2024	406, 420, 506, 120-B IPC	Sector-49, Chandigarh

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in compliance to the order dated 19.12.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such interim bail granted to the petitioner may be confirmed.
3. Learned counsel for respondent U.T., Chandigarh, on



instructions received from ASI Kiranpal has intimated that the petitioner has joined investigation and is no more required for any custodial investigation in this case nor he is required for further investigation.

4. Heard.

5. During the course of hearing on 19.12.2024, the following order was passed:-

“ 2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case without there being any specific overt act attributed to him. He contends that the matter in question pertains to the matrimonial dispute inter se the son of the complainant and the niece of the petitioner. He contends that the petitioner happens to be the maternal uncle of the girl, namely Gurpreet Kaur, whose marriage with the son of the complainant was solemnized on 03.07.2023. He contends that there is no role of the petitioner in the allegations of payment of any amount to some travel agent nor they have any concern with the conduct of Gurpreet Kaur with her husband in any manner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner being 54 years old has been falsely named in this case. He contends that the petitioner is not the habitual criminal, although one case was registered against him for the offence under Section 376 and 120-B IPC and 6 of the POCSO Act, registered at P.S. Tanda, District Hoshiarpur, on the allegation of conspiracy but he has already been granted the concession of interim bail. He contends that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, proceeded to dismiss the bail application vide order dated 07.12.2024 (Annexure P-2) only on the ground that this fact was not mentioned in the bail petition. Hence, the instant petition seeking concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor, Chandigarh, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondent and, on instructions from ASI Ram Pal Singh, prays for time to file the status report/reply in the matter.

6. Adjourned to 20.01.2025.

7. Needful be done well before the date fixed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite.



8. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS)."

6. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned Public Prosecutor and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 19.12.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 19.12.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

7. The petition stands allowed.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

18.02.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No