

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

CRM-M-2979-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 28.09.2017

Navjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. R.S. Bains, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Harish Nain, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

CRM-20081-2017

CRM application is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.48 dated 29.12.2015, registered under Sections 323, 406, 506 and 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, (for short, 'the IPC') at Women Police Station, Yamunanagar.

Heard.

On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed:-

“The parties are present in person.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has offered to pay a sum of Rupees five lakh towards full and final settlement, whereas, learned counsel for the complainant states that the petitioner is a real estate consultant and has sold 3-4 properties in the area of Pinjore. It is also asserted that the petitioner also received approximately Rupees seventy lakh in lieu of the acquisition proceedings carried out by the State of Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to place on record the list of properties sold by him in the last three years along with the details of the amount received by the petitioner in the acquisition proceedings, as stated above and address arguments.

Post again on 28.09.2017.

Interim order to continue.”

In pursuance to the above order, a duly sworn affidavit of the petitioner has been filed in the Court, which is taken on record. As per the affidavit, an amount of ₹65,00,000/- had been received by the family during acquisition proceedings. The receipt of the aforementioned amount indicates the financial status of the petitioner's family. The petitioner has offered an amount of ₹5,00,000/- towards full and final settlement.

Earlier, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. However, the mediation failed as the petitioner did not join the mediation proceedings.

Keeping in view the above, this Court feels that the offer made by the petitioner lacks *bona fide*, rendering him disentitled to the

discretionary relief sought in the present petition.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of the Court, on the merits of the case.

28.09.2017
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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