

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

CRM-M -43270 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.01.2017

Sohan Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Saurav Khurana, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

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.145 dated 08.03.2008, registered under Sections 420, 467, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at PS Civil Line, Amritsar.

On 14.12.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Petitioner, being a proclaimed offender, in a case of the year 2008, is prima facie not entitled for any indulgence but in view of the fact that the petitioner claims to have compromised the matter with complainant respondent No.2 Dilbagh Singh vide Annexure P-4, I deem it appropriate to give fair opportunity to the petitioner to appear before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

Notice to the respondents for 24.01.2017.

Meanwhile, an interim direction is issued that the petitioner will put in appearance before the investigating officer on or before 24.12.2016. In case of petitioner doing

so, he will be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.”

Thereafter, on 23.12.2016, the following order had passed the following order:-

“Misc. application is allowed.

Order dated 14.12.2016, is modified to the effect that the petitioner will put in appearance before the Area Magistrate/Duty Magistrate within a period of 10 days from today. In case of petitioner doing so, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the said Court.”

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance of order dated 23.12.2016, the petitioner has appeared before the trial Court and has furnished bail/surety bonds. The photocopy of order dated 26.12.2016, passed by the trial Court is taken on record as Mark 'A'.

The learned State counsel does not dispute the above said fact.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 23.12.2016, is made absolute.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

24.01.2017
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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