

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

Date of Decision : 15.10.2015

1. CRM-M No. 25484 of 2015 (O&M)

Deepak Kumar	Petitioner
versus	
State of Haryana	 Respondent

2. CRM-M No. 28022 of 2015 (O&M)

Surinder alias Chhinda	Petitioner
Versus	
State of Haryana	 Respondent

3. CRM-M No. 29499 of 2015 (O&M)

Vishavjeet Singh	Petitioner
versus	
State of Haryana	 Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr.Aman Pal, Advocate for the petitioner in
CRM-M-25484-2015.
Mr.Paras Talwar, Advocate for the petitioner/s in
CRM-M-28022-2015 and CRM-29499-2015.
Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

- i. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
- ii. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
- iii. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

The aforesaid three petitions for regular bail have been filed by
the petitioner/s in case bearing FIR No. 77 dated 28.03.2015, under Sections

420, 120-B IPC and later on added Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula. Since they all have arisen out of a common FIR, the same are being disposed of by this common order. For discussion CRM-M-25484-2015 is being taken wherein, on 10.08.2015, the following order was passed:-

“ This is a petition for grant of regular bail.

The allegations are that the land belonging to the Municipal Committee Panchkula was sought to be transferred in favour of the petitioner by way of sale deed.

Counsel for the petitioner states that actually the petitioner was completely innocent and that now he is willing to get the said sale deed cancelled.

Counsel for the respondent, on the other hand, disputes the innocence of the petitioner.

However, at this stage I deem it appropriate to release the petitioner on interim bail till the next date of hearing to enable him to get the said sale deed cancelled. Adjourned to 14.9.2015. The petitioner be released on interim bail till the next date of hearing to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula.”

On 14.09.2015 the following order was passed in CRM-M-25484-2015:-

“ Counsel for the petitioner has argued that during the pendency of the present FIR, the Municipal Corporation Panchkula had filed a civil suit for cancellation of the sale deed. In that civil suit, the petitioner has moved an application for placing on record written statement, as per which he had said that he would have no objection if the sale deed is cancelled.

Learned DAG Haryana states that she has no knowledge about this fact and seeks an adjournment to ascertain the correctness or otherwise of this assertion.

Adjourned to 15.10.2015.

Meanwhile, interim order to continue.”

Today learned DAG, on instructions from ASI Rajvir, states

that the averment that the petitioner has filed no objection for cancellation of sale deed is correct.

In the circumstances I do not deem it appropriate to deny bail to the present petitioner/s and the order dated 10.08.2015 is made absolute.

Petitions stand disposed of.

Since the main case has been decided, the Criminal Misc.Application, if any also stands disposed of.

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

October 15, 2015
sunita