

203

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

CRM-M-1080 of 2015

Date of decision: August 17, 2015

Mahesh Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima, AAG Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Kharb, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.479 dated 21.07.2014, under Section 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Following order was passed by this Court on 20.02.2015:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions submits that the petitioner is ready to pay ₹12 lacs (Rupees Twelve lacs only) to respondent No.2-Informant Deepak Sehgal, provided he has no objection of quashing of the impugned FIR and grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-Informant has agreed to the above proposal. He has further agreed that out of said ₹12 lacs (Rupees Twelve lacs only), ₹4 lacs (Rupees four lacs only) would be paid within 15 days from today and the remaining amount within two months

from today and thereafter respondent No.2-Informant shall have no objection if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed. He further submits that respondent No.2-Informant has no objection if the ad-interim anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the State submits that in view of the statements suffered by the learned counsel for the private parties, he has no objection if the petitioner is directed to join the investigation.

In view of the above, the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on 03.03.2015 at 10.00 A.M., and in the event of her arrest, she would be admitted to ad-interim bail by the Arresting Officer.

The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 438(2), Cr.P.C.

Adjourned to 24.04.2015.”

Learned State counsel who is assisted by the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 has submitted that in terms of the above order, petitioner has failed to deposit the amount in question.

In the present case, interim bail was granted to the petitioner as she had stated that she was ready to pay ₹12,00,000/- to respondent No.2, but has failed to do so despite the fact that the said statement was made on 20.02.2015. Hence, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made out as she has failed to honour the statement made by her through her counsel on 20.02.2015.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

August 17, 2015
mahavir