

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

(1)

**Crl. Misc. No.M-27931 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 26, 2017**

Vikram Singh

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....RESPONDENT(s).

(2)

Crl. Misc. No.M-29921 of 2017 (O&M)

Chiranji

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Prabhjeet Singh Sullar, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Deepak Grewal, D.A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Both the aforementioned petitions have been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.16 dated 26.01.2017 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 409 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Narnaul District Mohindergarh.

Heard.

Learned State counsel submits that petitioners have joined the investigation, which is still in progress. As per report of Inspector General of Police dated 23.10.2017, forest officer has already compounded the matter and got deposited the fine from Chiranji, hence, no further action under the Forest Act is required.

Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that police has not effected the recovery of the stolen trees and the implements used to cut trees, from the petitioners.

Initially, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kanina on investigation gave report that petitioners have not cut the trees. Now, Inspector General of Police, Rewari has also directed that no further action is to be taken against the petitioners. The matter is stated to have been compounded by the forest officer. Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of further investigation, as such, there is no reason to accept the contention of learned counsel for the complainant.

In view of submission of learned State counsel but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, both these petitions are allowed. Order dated 02.08.2017 passed in CRM-M-27931-2017 and order dated 18.08.2017 passed in CRM-M-29921-2017 are made absolute till the presentation of challan, subject to the following terms:-

- (i) that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by the police as and when required;
- (ii) that the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the accusation against them so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the

Court or to any police officer;

- (iii) that the petitioners shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court.
- (iv) that the petitioners will seek regular bail on the presentation of challan in Court, which the trial Court will decide on the basis of evidence collected during investigation.

October 26, 2017
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

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