

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

CRM-M -32292 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.11.2016

Vijay @ Sunny

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Jattan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Naveen Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana
assisted by ASI Balwant Rai.

Mr. J.S. Cooner, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.267 dated 29.07.2016, registered under Sections 406, 419, 420 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Ambala Cantt., District Ambala.

On 14.09.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR nor any role has attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Matlub.

At the oral request made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant-Bhushan Kumar, Son of Mahinder Singh, resident of Village Rampur, Amabala Cantt, District Ambala,

Haryana is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 at this stage.

Registry is directed to amend the memo of parties accordingly.

Notice of motion for 30.11.2016.

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

1.That he shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

2.That he 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 he shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 14.09.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

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 14.09.2016, 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.

30.11.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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