

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-3017 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 15, 2016

Sanjay Golani and another

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.R.S.Athwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Vikramjit Singh, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.S.M.Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.275 dated 03.10.2015 under
Sections 406, 420, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Baldev
Nagar, Ambala.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel as well
as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned
State counsel and have gone through the record.

As per the prosecution version, the allegations against the
petitioners are that they facilitated the sale of the vehicle to the complainant

and thereafter, they have not supplied the 'NOC' due to which the transfer of the vehicle in the name of complainant, could not be effected.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have already joined the investigation and they have handed over the relevant documents to the Investigating Officer to facilitate the transfer of the vehicle in the name of the complainant.

Learned State counsel contended that Investigating Officer wants to verify the documents.

The perusal of the record shows that the documents have been handed over before 30.03.2016. Earlier also, date was taken for verifying the documents. No ground has been given as to why the documents have not been got verified for the last more than three months.

Otherwise also, the petitioners have joined the investigation and handed over the documents to the Investigating Officer. The petitioners are no more required for custodial interrogation. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody. The petitioners have not misused the benefit of interim bail granted to them since 28.01.2016.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioners are entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the present petition is accepted and the order dated 28.01.2016 granting interim bail to the petitioners is made absolute.

July 15, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE