

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

CRM-M-328 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: September 26, 2017

Rajesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. A.S. Barnala, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mrs. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.772 dated 03.12.2016, under Sections 420, 427, 447, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the allegations made by the prosecution are that the petitioner had acted as a mediator in the matter of agreement that was executed between Geeta, Vikas and the complainant. Beyond this, there is no allegation that the petitioner-Rajesh Kumar had accepted any money from anybody and therefore, the petitioner would be entitled to get confirmation of the *ad interim* bail order dated 11.01.2017 granted by this Court.

Learned State counsel opposed the plea for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that the petitioner and others were hand in gloves for commission of the offence in question.

I have perused the FIR and after hearing learned counsel for the rival parties, I find that the amount of ₹20 lakhs was paid to Geeta and Viaks and the present petitioner had only acted as a mediator, who helped in scribing the said agreement etc. Beyond that there is no role ascribed to the petitioner. In that view of the matter, I think he would be entitled to grant of anticipatory bail.

Hence, this petition is allowed. Interim order dated 11.01.2017 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made absolute.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

September 26, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No