

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M No.339 of 2015

Date of Decision:28.01.2015

Satish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR.

**Present: Mr.B.S.Bhalla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.Jaspreet Singh Sekhon, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent-State.**

MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR, J.(oral)

Petitioner-Satish Kumar son of Om Parkash, has preferred the instant petition for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him along with his other main co-accused, vide FIR No.474 dated 15.12.2014, on accusation of having committed the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, by the police of Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar.

2. Notice of the petition was issued to the State.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, going through the record with their valuable help and considering the entire matter deeply, to my mind, the present petition for anticipatory bail deserves to be accepted in this context.

4. During the course of preliminary hearing, the following order was passed on January 07, 2015 by this Court:-

“Learned counsel, inter alia, contended that the petitioner is a practicing Advocate in District Courts at Amritsar. He has just attested the impugned registered sale deed in good faith. The argument is that the petitioner is not, in any way, beneficiary from the alleged sale deed. Moreover, nothing is to be recovered from him.

Heard.

Notice of motion be issued to the respondent, returnable for 28.01.2015.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation before the next date of hearing. In the event of his arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit him to bail on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds in the sum of Rs.25,000/- to his satisfaction.”

5. At the very outset, on instructions from ASI Charanjit Singh, learned State Counsel has acknowledged the factual matrix and submitted that the petitioner has already joined the investigation. He is no longer required for further interrogation, at this stage. There is no history of his previous involvement in any other criminal case. Even, since the prosecution has not yet submitted the final police report(challan) against the accused, so, the conclusion of trial will naturally take a long time.

6. In the light of aforesaid reasons, taking into consideration the peculiar facts & the special circumstances, emanating from the record, as discussed here-in-above and without commenting further anything on merits, lest it may prejudice the case of either side during the course of trial of the main case, the instant petition for anticipatory bail is accepted. The interim bail already granted to the petitioner, by virtue of indicated order of this Court, is hereby made absolute, subject to the compliance of the conditions, as contemplated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Needless to mention that, nothing observed here-in-above, would reflect, on merits in the trial of the case, in any manner, as the

same has been so recorded for a limited purpose of deciding the present petition for pre-arrest bail. At the same time, in case, the petitioner does not cooperate or join the investigation, the prosecution would be at liberty to move a petition for cancellation of his bail in this Court.

January 28, 2015
seema

(**MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR**)
JUDGE