

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

**C.R.M-M No.16158 of 2016  
Date of Decision : 13.07.2016**

Anil Kumar @ Johny

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI**

**\*\*\***

Present : Mr. N.G. Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. K.K. Goyal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**\*\*\***

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)**

Short affidavit filed by Jasmeet Singh Sahiwal, PPS, Deputy

Superintendent of Police, Mansa is taken on record. Copy has been

supplied.

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.28 dated 04.04.2016, registered under Sections 420, 406 IPC, at Police Station Mansa City-I, District Mansa.

As per the allegations, the complainant had purchased land measuring 600 sq. yards from one Pawan Kumar and Raj Kumar and had got a sale deed listed for 200 sq. yards and General Power of Attorney for 400 sq. yards. It is further alleged that to help the complainant in getting the land partitioned and for getting the possession of the land the petitioner took Rs.9 lacs in the name of various officials and also prevailed upon the complainant to transfer 200 sq. yards in his name. On the last date the Ld. Judge had directed the State to verify whether the complainant was himself not guilty of attempt to bribe Government servants. As per the report filed today, it has been found that the complainant is not guilty.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner himself had purchased land measuring 200 sq. yards from the complainant and was equally interested in getting the possession of his share and in these circumstances the allegation that the petitioner got

money from the complainant is very thin.

In my opinion, without going into the merits of the case, I do not deem it appropriate to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Resultantly, the petition is allowed. In the event of arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the investigating officer on 20.07.2016 and on any other date as and when his presence is required. In case the petitioner does not appear before the investigating officer in the aforesaid manner the present petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

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

**July 13, 2016**  
*ashish*

**( AJAY TEWARI )**  
**JUDGE**