

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

CRM-M No. 18557 of 2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: May 30, 2017

Anup Singh Dahiya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate and
Ms. Preeti Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG., Haryana.

Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the complainant.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (ORAL)

Upon notice issued, though the petitioner, as per learned State counsel, is stated to have joined the investigation, however, learned counsel for the complainant submits that infact the “original accused” in the FIR is Sunil. Learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner initially made a complaint stating that the aforesaid Sunil and others entered his house and tried to misbehave with his wife, leading to the filing of the FIR at the instance of the petitioner, but subsequently the petitioner wanted to withdraw that complaint and upon being asked for the recording from the CCTV camera installed in his house, he had submitted that it was in a damaged condition.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant submits that a video recording in the form of a C.D. has been handed over

was brandishing a fire arm at the aforesaid Sunil, and in the petitioner's house he was asked 'to not sit on the sofa but on the floor'.

Upon query to learned counsel for the complainant as to what was the reason for the dispute, he submits that there was an issue on old currency notes, in respect of which there was a “dealing” between the parties.

In the aforesaid circumstances, I see no reason to continue the interim order in favour of the petitioner.

The petition is accordingly dismissed and the interim order is vacated.

Obviously the investigating agency would go into the matter on all aspects of the case, including the alleged money laundering etc. between the parties.

However, it is made clear that the observations made herein are only in the context of a petition seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

May 30, 2017
archana

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/no
Whether reportable: Yes/no