

203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41061-2016
Date of decision-31.05.2017

Sandeep Vaid

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. M.S.Sachdev, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.184 dated 08.09.2016, registered under Sections 420 and 409 of the Indian Penal Code (in short IPC) at Police Station Basti Bawa Khel, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

On 27.01.2017, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Contends that the petitioner being an employee of Shah Sons Food Company allegedly recommended the complainant to supply goods manufactured by the company to various retailers. There is neither any amount allegedly received by the petitioner nor credited in the accounts of the firm.

Post again on 10.03.2017.

The petitioner is directed to join the investigation. Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the Arresting Officer, he shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

1. That he shall make himself available for

interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

2. That he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and;

3. That he shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 27.01.2017 the petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel on instructions, submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation but recovery is yet to be effected.

Learned counsel for the complainant also opposes the bail application.

Heard.

Keeping in view the assertion that at the time of resignation the petitioner had cleared all the amounts due to him on 21.10.2015 and the fact that the present FIR was registered on 08.09.2016 and the petitioner has joined the investigation, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 27.01.2017, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

May 31, 2017
vanita

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