



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CRM-M No.5915 of 2025

DATE OF DECISION : 7th FEBRUARY, 2025

Jai Ram

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

* * * *

Present : Ms. Suman Kumari, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vikram Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

* * * *

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS in case FIR No.31 dated 27.04.2023 under Sections 406 & 420 IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professional Regulation Act 2012 (Section 120-B IPC, added later on), registered at Police Station City Samana, District Patiala.

2. On 31.01.2025, 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, at the outset, submits that the parties have reached an amicable settlement and the misunderstanding between them stands removed. It has also been submitted that the prime accused in the instant



FIR have already been extended the concession of anticipatory bail on the same grounds.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. Vikram Kumar, Advocate has entered appearance and filed his power of attorney on behalf of respondent No.2 which is taken on record. H does not dispute the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the parties have reached an amicable settlement. He further submits that in view of the compromise reached between the parties, he does not oppose the prayer for extending the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Learned State counsel, however, prays for an adjournment to get necessary instructions.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 31.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. It has also been submitted that the parties have arrived at amicable settlement.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has not disputed the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties. He further submits that in view of the compromise effected between the parties he does not opposed the prayer made in the present petition.

5. 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.



6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 31.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7th February, 2025
'raj'

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes* *No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes* *No*