

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43912-2015

Date of decision: July 14, 2016.

Bintu @ Mintu

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Shri Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether to be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Reply filed in Court is taken on record.

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties; perused the record and seen the interim order dated 24.12.2015 made by this Court granting relief of ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Learned Counsel for the State fairly states that the petitioner joined the investigation and has cooperated with the investigating machinery. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the bona fide purchaser for value in respect of two sale deeds (Annexure P-3 and P-4) for the amount in a sum of Rs.14.35 lacs and Rs.4.96 lacs respectively from the power of attorney of one Hawa Singh. He submits

that the whereabouts of said Hawa Singh were not known for 20 years. But then, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that he paid the valuable consideration and purchased the property under the two sale deeds, as above.

In that view of the matter, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 24.12.2015 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to remain on bail till the conclusion of the trial.

Petition disposed of.

July 14, 2016.
kadyan

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge