

208

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

CRM-M-32611 of 2016

Date of decision: October 24, 2016

Smt. Geeta and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the interim order dated 16.09.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

In FIR No.172 dated 25.05.2015, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal, petitioners were granted ad-interim anticipatory bail vide order dated 16.09.2016 by this Court.

Learned State counsel vehemently opposed the petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that, though, the petitioners had taken earnest money has not executed the sale-deed.

In my opinion, the petitioners deserves to be granted anticipatory bail in the light of nature of dispute.

In that view of the matter, interim order dated 16.09.2016

granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners, is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

October 24, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No