

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

210

**CRM-M-50290-2019
Date of decision: 31.01.2020**

Jaskirat Singh @ Lala

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kaundal, DAG, Punjab
for respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "Cr.P.C") is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.227 dated 14.10.2017 registered under Sections 307, 148, 427 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar, District Amritsar.

Vide order dated 27.11.2019 passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join the investigation.

Learned State Counsel has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner was

accompanying other students. He was not armed with any weapon and injury caused to Arshdeep Singh which was declared to be dangerous to life is not attributed to him. The petitioner has joined the investigation. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Satpal Singh, has acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 27.11.2019 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and submitted that his custodial interrogation is not required for effecting any further recovery.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner and role attributed to him and the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and order dated 27.11.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions enumerated in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C., failing which the protection of anticipatory bail order shall not be available to him.

31.01.2020

Rajeev (rvs)

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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