

201(3 cases)

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

Date of Decision : 29.11.2016

1) CRM-M-26863 of 2015

Harbans Singh ...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana ...Respondent

2) CRM-M-26981 of 2015

Gurnam Singh ...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

3) CRM-M-27044 of 2015

Manoj Kumar ...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-26863 & 27044-2015).

Mrs. Kiran Bala Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-26981-2015).

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

Mr. Vivek Suri, Advocate
for the complainant – respondent No.2.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

These petitions have been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.139 dated 28.05.2015 registered under Sections 406 & 420 IPC, at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula. All the cases are disposed of by the common order.

As per the allegations the petitioners had sold the property to the complainant – respondent No.2 which was under the possession of a third person. On 15.10.2015 the following order was passed:-

“With the intervention of the learned counsel, the dispute has been settled. It has been agreed that within 6 months the concerned petitioner will repurchased the property what he has sold to the complainant for a total amount of Rs.6 lakhs and the complainant get it re-transferred in the name of the concerned petitioner. It has further been agreed that after the aforesaid exercise the parties shall file a petition for quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise.

Adjourned to 12.05.2016.

A photocopy of this order be placed on files of the connected cases.”

These matters have repeatedly been adjourned to enable the petitioners to stick to the undertaking given to this Court but even till today the payment has not been made.

Learned counsel for the complainant – respondent No.2 has argued that the petitioners have not only defrauded the complainant but they have also taken this Court for a ride for more than a year.

I find the contention of learned counsel for the complainant-

respondent No.2 to be true.

In the circumstances, these petitions are dismissed.

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

November 29, 2016
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No