

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31464-2015

Date of decision: August 31, 2016.

Sonika Choudhary

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

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

Present: Shri Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties.

Learned Counsel for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, states that the petitioner who is owner of the company, and their employees used to make calls on the internet promising to give rewards. After hearing learned Counsel for the rival parties, I find that there is no specific collection of evidence as yet against the petitioner and the complaint is stated to have been lodged with the police by an aggrieved ex-employee whose services are stated to have been terminated.

Be that as it may, the Investigating Officer is at liberty to collect specific evidence and then apply for modification of this order granting anticipatory bail. However, for the present, in the absence of specific and particular evidence, the ad-interim relief granted by this Court

on 16.09.2015 will have to be made absolute reserving liberty in favour of the Investigating Officer to approach this Court for modification of this order as and when he is able to collect specific evidence against the petitioner.

Consequently, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 16.09.2015 is made absolute till conclusion of the trial.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

August 31, 2016.
kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No