

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M No.8877 of 2016

Date of Decision:-07.04.2016

Vikas Sharma & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
assisted by ASI Ajit Singh.

Mr. Amit Kumar Jain, Advocate for the Complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

On the previous date of hearing the following order was
passed:-

“ *Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case
FIR No.143 dated 24.4.2015 under Sections
406,420,120-B IPC, PS Rajindera Park, Gurgaon,
Distt.Gurgaon.*

*Accused petitioners-Vikas Sharma and Vikram
Sharma are Directors of M/s Supreme Infrastructure
Public Limited Company who had contracted with the*

complainant-company M/s Translite Scaffolding Limited for supply of shuttering material on rent. Since there is default of payment of rent as also return of the shuttering material, the aforesaid FIR has been lodged.

At the time of hearing learned counsel for the petitioners submits that his clients are ready and willing to pay the entire rentals due as also make sincere efforts to get the shuttering material returned lying in the custody of another contracted Principal company.

Notice of motion for 7.4.2016.

At this stage, Mr. Amit Jain, counsel for the complainant accepts notice and states that complainant is not averse to referring the parties for mediation.

In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer/Trial Court. Petitioners shall appear before the I.O., as and when called upon for investigation and shall also be bound by all the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

To be shown in the urgent list. ”

At the time of hearing today, learned Counsel for the State submits that the petitioners have not joined investigation and in fact have been declared as proclaimed offenders vide order dated 2.4.2016.

Learned Counsel for the complainant submits that even his party was not approached with any offer for amicable settlement.

In view of the conduct of the petitioners as also the nature and gravity of the offence, no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is made out.

Dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

April 07, 2016
Vinay