

211

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

CRM-M-21642 of 2016

Date of decision: August 22, 2016

Sushil Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Virender Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned counsel for the complainant has pointed out affidavit that was shown by the petitioner. Upon reading of the affidavit, it is seen that the petitioner had agreed to pay back the amount to the complainant. The counsel for the complainant as well as counsel for the petitioner stated that there is no such compliance of payment of money.

In that view of the matter, the petitioner does not deserve to be continued on anticipatory bail.

Hence, the petition seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is rejected. Interim order dated 23.06.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stands vacated.

Dismissed.

**(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE**

August 22, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No