

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

**CRM-M No.44018 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.05.2017**

Rajiv Tinna and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Lovekirat Chahal, Advocate
for the complainant.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C, the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in FIR No.578, dated 21.07.2016, registered under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Karnal Civil Lines, District Karnal.

Vide order of this Court dated March 07, 2017, this Court had granted ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners, to the satisfaction of the Arresting officer.

Seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioners, learned counsel submits that after investigation the police had filed a cancellation report but while the matter was pending before the Competent Court, a Special Investigation Team was constituted by the State to re-investigate the matter. It is further submitted that the FIR portrays only a civil dispute between the petitioners and the complainant which as on date has been

settled. It is still further submitted that under interim orders passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined investigation and have fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Balwinder Singh admits that the petitioners have joined investigation and have fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned counsel for the complainant has admitted the factum that the matter has been settled between the complainant and the petitioners.

After considering the above submissions made by learned State counsel as also learned counsel for the complainant but without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated March 07, 2017 granting ad-interim bail anticipatory to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions prescribed under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

May 08, 2017

rittu

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No