

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

CRM-M No. 35957 of 2016
Date of decision : November 22, 2016

Raman Lal

..... Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. GN Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. KS Pannu, DAG Punjab

Mr. Harjeet Savra, Advocate
for the complainant.

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR
No.68, dated 2.6.2016, registered under Sections 420, 406 of the IPC, at
Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur.

On 17.10.2016, the following order was passed :-

“ This is second application for anticipatory bail.
The earlier bail application was dismissed because
even after giving an undertaking, the petitioner did not

refund ₹ 2.5 lacs to the complainant. The petitioner had given a cheque of ₹ 1,00,000/- which was dishonoured. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner was not in a position to make any payment and further states that now petitioner is ready to make payment. He states that an amount of ₹ 1.25 lacs would be paid in cash on 22.10.2016 and the remaining amount of ₹ 1.25 lacs again in cash on or before 27.10.2016.

Adjourned to 27.10.2016.

In the meantime, the arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.”

Thereafter, the petitioner paid ₹ 1.25 lac and the matter was again adjourned to enable him to pay the remaining amount. Counsel for the petitioner has again sought time to make the payment.

Counsel for the complainant states that the petitioner has been misleading this Court and has obtained an order in his favour by false statement.

Counsel for the petitioner has re-iterated that the petitioner is still ready and willing to make the settlement.

In view of these discordant stands, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this petition with a direction that in case the petitioner appears before the Investigating Officer on or before 2.12.2016 with a draft of ₹ 1.25 lac in favour of the complainant, the IO, in the event of his arrest shall release the petitioner on anticipatory bail to his satisfaction subject to the compliance of the provisions as contained in Section 438(2) of the

CRM-M No. 35957 of 2016

::3::

accordingly. It is made clear that in the event of default on behalf of the petitioner, this petition would be deemed to be dismissed.

November 22, 2016

`kk'

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No