

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

CRM-M -15320 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.09.2016

Jagjeet Singh @ Jagat Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Sunny Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Balbir Singh.

Mr. B.S. Chahar, Advocate
for the complainant/applicant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

CRM-30830-2016

The learned counsel for the complainant/applicant does
not press the present application at this stage.

Dismissed as not pressed.

Main Case

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the
Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory
bail in FIR No.110 dated 12.03.2016, registered under Sections 420
and 406 IPC, at Police Station Sadar Hansi, District Hisar.

On 05.05.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Petitioner is alleged to have received a sum of Rs.32.50 lacs on the basis of an agreement of sale of 8 kanals of land on August 24, 2013, as per the allegations of complainant Hoshier Singh. Said land was acquired in 2014 but the compensation has been received by the petitioner.

A controversy has been raised to the effect that liability, if any, is of civil nature.

Petitioner claims that he had never entered into an agreement of sale and that blank papers bearing his signatures have been misused by the complainant.

Notice to Advocate General, Haryana, for July 13, 2016.

Meanwhile, an interim direction is issued that the petitioner will join investigation on May 14, 2016 or any other date as required by the investigating officer and in case of his doing so, he will be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 05.05.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

The learned counsel for the complainant also does not oppose the bail application.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 05.05.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

29.09.2016
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No