

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

**CRM-M-17215 of 2015
Date of decision : 16.07.2015**

Samarjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Vermani, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Doon, AAG, Haryana.

DARSHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed by petitioner under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of the anticipatory bail in case FIR No.800 dated 26.11.2011, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Gurgaon City, Gurgaon.

2. On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed : -

“Learned counsel for the petitioner pleads that the petitioner is the bonafide lessee of the land in dispute. He contended that the lease deed was executed by D.P.Singh. There was nothing to suspect the genuineness of the sale deed in favour of D.P.Singh. There is no material to connect the petitioner with the transaction of sale in favour of D.P.Singh. He further contended that even a civil suit filed by M/s Sai Baba Water Technologies Private Ltd. The complaint in this has been dismissed by the Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Gurgaon.

Notice of motion for 16.07.2015.

In the meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner, he will be admitted to the interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer on the conditions that he will join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer, that he will not directly or indirectly tamper with the prosecution evidence and that he will not leave India without the prior permission of the Court. ”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was a *bona fide* lessee of the land in dispute and has nothing to do with the alleged forged sale deed executed in favour of D.P. Singh.

4. On the instructions of ASI Balraj Singh, Police Station City Gurgaon, learned State counsel states that the petitioner has already joined the investigation. He has been sufficiently interrogated. Nothing is to be recovered from his possession and is not required for any custodial interrogation.

5. Consequently, the present petition is hereby allowed and the order of interim anticipatory bail dated 25.05.2015 is hereby made absolute subject to the conditions that the petitioner will join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer; that he will not directly or indirectly tamper with the prosecution evidence; that he will not leave India without the prior permission of the trial Court.

16.07.2015
sunil yadav

(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE