

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

CRM-M -11694 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.05.2017

Bhupinder Pal Singh @ Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.
assisted by ASI Kewal Singh.

Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

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.0023 dated 04.03.2017, registered under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar.

On 06.04.2017, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been admitted to interim bail vide order dated 30.03.2017. Thereafter, the petitioner had been repeatedly appearing before the Investigating Officer which is proved from the affidavits (Annexure P-3) of Joban Singh, Nain Singh and

Satish Kumar who are respectable persons of the area. However, ASI Manjit Lal wrongly deposed before the learned trial Court that the petitioner had not joined the investigation which led to dismissal of the bail application.

Learned counsel further contends that the parties had entered into compromise (Annexure P-5), on the basis of which quashing petition No. CRM-M-10538-2017 was filed. However, it is asserted that after the dismissal of the bail petition, the complainant has also back tracked from settling the matter as per the terms of the compromise earlier entered into by the parties. Out of alleged liability of Rs.92 lakhs, Rs.85 lakhs has already been paid. The petitioner undertakes to repay the remaining amount as per the terms and conditions of the compromise.

Notice of motion for 29.05.2017.

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 06.04.2017, 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.

The learned counsel for the complainant duly acknowledges the factum of payment made by the petitioner.

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 06.04.2017, 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.

30.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No