



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

217

CRM-M-54279-2024

Date of decision: 28.01.2025

GURDHIR SINGH MANN @ DHIRA

...Petitioner

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vishavjeet S. Gill, Advocate for
Mr. Tanvir Singh Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in FIR No.5 dated 12.01.2022 under Sections 302, 427, 148, 149, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 427, 148, 149, 120-B of the IPC added and Section 34 of the IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. on 29.10.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that it was after 12 years of the occurrence in question, which allegedly took place on 12.01.2022, the petitioner was now being sought to be implicated in the crime in question for allegedly harbouring the assassins, who gunned down both the deceased on the fateful



day. It has been further submitted that even as far as the conspiracy angle is concerned, the petitioner has been implicated only on the basis of an alleged conversation between him and cp-accused Sukhpreet Singh @Sukha, that too much after the occurrence in question. It has also been argued that the petitioner has no connection with the prime accused, who allegedly gunned down both the deceased, coupled with the fact that he did not have any motive whatsoever to connive with them or even harbour them after the murders in question.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 29.10.2024, 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 29.10.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

January 28, 2025
poonam

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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