

206+102

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

CRM-M-37690 of 2014

Date of Decision: January 12, 2015.

Arun Vig

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. D.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.308 dated 16.08.2014, under Sections 115, 195, 285, 120-B and 307/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 ('Act' for short), registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt.

While issuing notice of motion, following order was passed by this Court on 05.11.2014:-

“Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that at this stage, cancellation report has not been presented in the FIR got registered by the petitioner.

Notice of motion for 12.01.2015.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, petitioner be admitted to interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. He shall abide by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

At this stage, Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant.”

Learned State counsel who is assisted by Assistant Sub Inspector Dharam Pal Singh has submitted that, although, petitioner has joined investigation, but recovery is yet to be effected from him. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that in fact, petitioner had connived with his co-accused Sajan Sharma, who had fired at the vehicle of the petitioner.

In the present case, FIR No.308 under Sections 307, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Act was registered at the instance of petitioner on 16.08.2014 at Police Station Ambala Cantt against Sudhir Verma. However, during the pendency of the investigation, it transpired that the FIR in question had been falsely lodged by the petitioner in connivance with Sajan Sharma. Petitioner has, although, joined investigation, but has not cooperated with the investigating agency. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

In these circumstances, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

January 12, 2015
m.singh