

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

CRM-M -37517 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.12.2016

Vinod Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vinay Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jaidev Singh.

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.195 dated 21.11.2014, registered under Section 420 of IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.

On 21.10.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that complainant deposited an amount of ₹1.5 crores in his savings account. Subsequently, on 25.03.2013 an amount of ₹ 1 crore from the savings account was transferred to mutual funds and on 22.11.2013, the amount was withdrawn and again brought back into savings account. As per the Banking Policy, in the process, standard 1 per cent was deducted as exit load. The benefit was shared by Bank and Chief Manager of the Bank as an incentive to him. The Chief General Manager who received the incentive in the transaction carried out on behalf of the Bank stands exonerated. Neither any wrongful gain is incurred by the

petitioner, nor any wrongful loss is caused to the complainant.

Notice of motion for 15.12.2016.

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 21.10.2016, 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.

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 21.10.2016, 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.

15.12.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable: Yes No