

**CRM-M-10250-2016 and
CRM-M-13819-2016**

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

Date of Decision: 30.11.2016

1. CRM-M-10250-2016

Makhan Lal and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

AND

2. CRM-M-13819-2016

Nitin Bansal and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Paras Talwar, Advocate,
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. V.S.Virk, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-10250-2016, filed by

**CRM-M-10250-2016 and
CRM-M-13819-2016**

13819-2016, filed by petitioners, Nitin Bansal, Sunny Bansal and Rakesh Kumar, under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.17 dated 17.02.2016, registered at Police Station Sector 19, Panchkula, District Panchkula, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in both these petitions. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested these petitions. Complainant also put in appearance through his counsel.

I have heard learned senior counsel for the petitioners; learned State counsel as well as learned senior counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

Learned counsel for the parties stated that both these petitions were sent to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for amicable settlement which has taken place. Copy of report of the Mediator has also been placed on the record.

Learned senior counsel for the complainant admitted the fact that compromise has taken place before the Mediator.

Furthermore, in pursuance of the orders dated 11.04.2016 passed in CRM-M-10250-2016 and dated 26.04.2016 passed in CRM-M-13819-2016, the petitioners have already joined the investigation. They are now not required for custodial interrogation. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present

**CRM-M-10250-2016 and
CRM-M-13819-2016**

case; without discussing the facts of the case in minute details; without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and in view of the fact that compromise has taken place between the parties, I find merit in both these petitions and the same are allowed. The orders dated 11.04.2016 passed in CRM-M-10250-2016 and dated 26.04.2016 passed in CRM-M-13819-2016, granting interim bail to the petitioners, are made absolute. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

30.11.2016
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No