

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

CRL. MISC. No.M-26330 OF 2017 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 13th SEPTEMBER, 2017

Pawan Goyal

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

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

* * * *

Present : Mr. Jasbir Singh Ahlawat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.0107 dated 05.04.2017 registered under Sections 406, 420 & 506 IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC added later on) at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner and the main accused Sanjeev Kumar had owned a firm at New Delhi. However the case of the prosecution is that Sanjeev had gone to the complainant and had offered to purchase goods worth ₹45,00,000/- and had given a cheque of ₹11,00,000/- also. Insofar as the present petitioner is concerned there is disclosure statement by Sanjeev that the petitioner is the person who is having firm along with him. In my opinion, that fact

by itself is not sufficient to deny the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In that view of the matter interim orders dated 21.07.2017 and 17.08.2017 are made absolute.

Disposed of accordingly.

13th SEPTEMBER, 2017
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>