

**Sr. No. 209
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM No. M-35307 of 2015
Date of Decision: 28.01.2016**

Mandeep Singh @ Raja

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Gourav Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Doon, AAG, Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA. J (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks concession of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.164 dated 16.05.2015, under Sections 387, 398 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sadar Tohana, District Fatehabad.

While issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court on 16.10.2015:

Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner Mandeep Singh @ Raja in case FIR No.164 dated 16.5.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 387, 398, 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Sadar, Tohana, District Fatehabad.

As per the allegations lodged by Arun Kumar, one Nath, Vikram, Murari accompanied by 15/16 boys had raided the liquor vend and demanded a ransom of Rs.50,000/- per month for permitting them to operate the liquor vend in the area. They are also alleged to have destroyed the vend on that day.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner-accused has surfaced in the disclosure statement of accused Rinku, whereas as per affidavit of the complainant and eye witness Pawan and Jagdish, the presence of petitioner at the site has been denied.

Notice of motion for 03.12.2015.

In the meanwhile, in the event of his arrest, petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the arresting/investigating officer. However, he shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.PC.”

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Satyawar, Police Station Sadar Tohana, District Fatehabad, would apprise the Court that the petitioner has since joined investigation. Further more, the observations contained in the notice of motion order have gone un rebutted.

In view of the above, petition is allowed. Order dated 16.10.2015, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Disposed of.

28.01.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**