

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

CRM-M -36158 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.11.2016

Satish Kumar Mittal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate and
Mr. Krishan M. Vohra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Satbir Singh.

Mr. A.K. Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

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.319 dated 25.08.2016, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal.

On 06.10.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the sale deed in question pertains to the year 1990. The FIR has been registered after a lapse of 26 years. However, inadvertently 17 years is reflected in the petition.

Notice of motion for 08.11.2016.

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.

To be heard along with CRM-M-31502-2016 on the adjourned date.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 06.10.2016, 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.

The learned counsel for the complainant opposes the bail application.

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 06.10.2016, 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.

08.11.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
-----------------------------	-----	----

Whether Reportable:	Yes	No
---------------------	-----	----