

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

**C.R.M-M No.12197 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 22.07.2016**

Nirmal Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. R.K.Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Additional A.G., Haryana.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

On 08.04.2016 the following order was passed :-

“Petitioner seeks benefit of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.166 dated 11.07.2015, under Sections 420, 406 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Farukhnagar, Gurgaon, District Gurgaon.

Counsel would submit that the role attributed to the present petitioner is of having introduced the vendor to the vendee pertaining to a transaction involving sale of a plot.

Counsel would categorically submit that the dispute is essentially civil in nature and the main accused i.e. Smt. Parveen Devi as also Om Parkash have already made over the

entire sale consideration to the Investigating Officer of the case and in pursuant thereto have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 17.03.2016 in CRM No.M-33204 of 2015.

Notice of motion, returnable for 22.07.2016.

In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and to join investigation.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and he shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned Additional Advocate General, on instructions from ASI Rajesh Kumar accepts the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

In these circumstances, I do not deem it appropriate to deny anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Resultantly, the petition is allowed. The interim order dated 08.04.2016 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(**AJAY TEWARI**)
JUDGE

22.07.2016
pooja sharma-I