

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

CRM-M-10598 of 2017
Date of Decision:1.6.2017

Pawan Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Manish Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.
Mr.Amit Kumar Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the complainant has appeared and produced in Court the information received from the Assistant Treasury Officer, Kosli (Rewari), under the Right to Information Act, 2005, stating to the effect that a stamp paper of a denomination of Rs.100/-, bearing Sr. No.786746, was issued to Shri Mukat Singh, Stamp Vendor, on 9.8.2016, from the Sub Treasury, Kosli.

A copy of the agreement of sale is sought to be placed on record by the petitioner himself, vide CRM No.11467 of 2017. A perusal of the photocopy of the said agreement (Annexure P.6), shows the number of the stamp

paper to be R 786746, with the date on the stamp of the stamp vendor, seen to be 8.4.2016, with the stamp paper having been used for the purpose of an agreement of sale, dated 8.4.2016.

Even so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is entitled to anticipatory bail on parity with a co-accused who has already been admitted to bail in CRM-M-16126-2017.

The aforesaid contention is rejected, in view of the information received by the complainant under the Right to Information Act, 2005, which learned State counsel does not dispute.

Therefore, still without making any comment on the actual merits of the case for or against the petitioner, which would be gone into by the investigating agency/trial Court as per the evidence led before it, however, it is not a case where the petitioner can be admitted to bail at this stage.

Dismissed.

The interim order is vacated.

June 1, 2017
KD

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No