

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

CRM-M -31502 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.11.2016

Satish Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. A.K. Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.319 dated 25.08.2016, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal, District Kaithal.

On 07.09.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that petitioner No.1 has purchased the plot in question from one Sham Lal who is GPA holder of Deepak Kumar and is owner of the plot as per mutation.

Notice of motion for 08.11.2016.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-

State. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned State counsel, in the Court.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioners by the Arresting Officer, they shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

- 1. That they shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- 2. That they shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and;*
- 3. That they shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”*

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 07.09.2016, the petitioners have joined the investigation

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioners have joined the investigation and they are not required for custodial interrogation.

The learned counsel for the complainant opposes 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 07.09.2016, 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.

08.11.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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