



219/1 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.293-2023
Date of Decision:21.04.2025

Satnam Singh @ Satta @ Panni ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition with a prayer to set aside the impugned order dated 14.12.2022 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Section 167(2) Cr.P.C. was dismissed by the trial Court.

2. The case was heard at length by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 20.03.2023 and the following observations were made, while granting the concession of interim bail to the petitioner:-

“Status report by way of affidavit Mr. Vavinder Kumar, DSP, STF Border Range District Amritsar filed on behalf of State is ordered to be taken on record along of Zimni (Annexure R-1) and copy of FIR (Annexure R-2). As per paragraph No.9 of the aforesaid status report, the petitioner was arrested in this case

on 9.6.2022 and during investigation, no incriminating evidence came on record against the petitioner and as such, the petitioner was found to be innocent by aforesaid Vavinder Kumar, DSP and thereafter an application was also moved before the Court concerned seeking discharge of the petitioner but the said application was dismissed by the trial Court vide order dated 17.12.2022. Admittedly the request made by the petitioner for grant of default bail under Section 167(2) Cr.P.C. was also declined by the trial Court. Even today the State counsel on instructions from SI Baljinder Singh has made statement that petitioner is not required by the police in the present case as per zimini dated 18.10.2022 recorded by DSP, STF Border Range District Amritsar.

In view of the above, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on interim bail till the next date of hearing subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. ”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has again raised the above referred submissions and submits that after the grant of concession of interim bail, the petitioner is regularly appearing before the trial Court and has not misused the concession of interim bail granted by this Court.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he admits that the petitioner is regularly appearing before the trial Court and the trial is at an advanced stage.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. At this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 20.03.2023 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing and shall not remain absent from the trial Court proceedings, without prior permission of the trial Court.

21.04.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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