

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

CRM-M -33643 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.11.2016

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

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

Mr. Naveen Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana
assisted by ASI Ramesh Kumar.

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.178 dated 18.08.2016, registered under Section 395 of IPC, at Police Station Sadar Narwana, District Jind.

On 04.10.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. In fact the petitioner was taken into custody and severe beatings were administered to him including head injury. He further contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR and un-named FIR was registered. Similarly the petitioner has been falsely framed in as many as 28 FIRs out of which he stands acquitted in 22 FIRs.

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 04.10.2016, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, however, he is a habitual offender and involved in more than 20 other FIRs.

The petitioner has joined the investigation. 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 04.10.2016, 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