

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

**CRM-M-30461-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: - 24.8.2017**

Satyapal Choudhary

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN.

Present: - Mr. Manoj Pundhir, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr. P.C. for granting anticipatory bail in case criminal complaint No. RBT-35/2017 dated 17.12.2013/06.01.2017 titled as Deepak Walia and others vs. Dr. Raj Pal and others under Sections 420, 406, 409, 467, 468, 471, 472, 506 and 120-B IPC passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal and the order dated 29.7.2017 (Annexure P-3), vide which the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail only for two months and directed to seek regular bail, may be modified and further directing the trial Court to release the petitioner on bail in the event of his surrender before the trial Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner had been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal vide order dated 29.7.2017 (Annexure P-3) and it is directed that this order shall remain in force for two months from today during which the applicant-accused shall appear before the trial Court and seek regular bail. He further submits that still he has apprehensions that trial Court will not grant

regular bail to the petitioner.

It is further submitted on behalf of the petitioner that with regard to the co-accused, Dr. Rajpal, vide order dated 3.6.2017, Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal has granted anticipatory bail but when he appeared before the trial Court, he was taken in custody and granted regular bail after 15 days by the Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal.

However, a perusal of the order dated 3.6.2017 passed in the case of co-accused-Dr. Rajpal, shows that pre-arrest bail was granted till the time, he was to appear before the trial Court and apply for regular bail whereas in the instant case, entire direction has been given by the Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal that for a period of two months, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.

It is apparent that the order dated 29.7.2017 passed in the case of the present petitioner shall remain in force till 29.9.2017 and therefore, apprehension of the petitioner that in case he appears before the trial Court and apply for regular bail, he may be sent to judicial lock up, is totally misconceived, as there is a clear direction given by the Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal that arrest of petitioner is stayed for a period of two months from the date of passing of the order i.e. 29.7.2017.

In view of above, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

24.8.2017
preeti

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No