

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:031250



(201)

CRM-M-64103-2024

Date of Decision: 05.03.2025

Jaswinder Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.

Present:- Mr. S.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab with
HC Gupreet Singh.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.J (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.42 dated 31.03.2022 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station, Cantt. Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Short reply by way of affidavit of Saravjeet Singh Brar, Dy.S.P., City-II, Bathinda on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in Court today. Same is taken on record and a copy has been supplied to counsel opposite.

On the last date of hearing, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“As per the allegations narrated in the FIR (Annexure P-1), a complaint was received from Deputy Secretary, Recruitment, PSPCL, Patiala giving information that for the examination of JE (Electrical) in response to advertisement No.CRA-291/17, one Gurmeet Singh, AEE had appeared in place of Jaswinder Singh, JE, the present petitioner. As per the FIR, enquiry was conducted, and thereafter, present FIR has been registered.

Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and a vague complaint has been filed due to enmity with some political person. Petitioner is ready to give his biometric and handwriting, thumb impression for comparison with the record of examination conducted for the said appointment of JE.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 19.12.2024, 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 19.12.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

05.03.2025

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No