

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

Sr. No.206

CRM-M No.46747 of 2016
Date of decision: 07.02.2017

Naveen Giri @ Saveen Giri

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Rajesh K. Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.138 dated 23.10.2016, registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC, at Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Vide order dated 28.12.2016, while issuing notice of motion, this Court had ordered that in the event of arrest, petitioner shall be admitted to ad-interim anticipatory bail subject to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner, after promising the complainant to be sent to Singapore had been taken ₹2 lakhs from her but after having accepted the money resiled from such promise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is

innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant. He further submits that it was ₹1 lakhs that the petitioner had taken from the complainant not to send her abroad but only as a loan and therefore, at the most, the dispute between the parties would be a civil dispute. He further submits that the matter has been compromise between the parties.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Daljit Kumar, submits that in pursuance to the ad-interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, the petitioner has joined investigation and he is no longer needed for any further questioning. He further admits that the compromise has been arrived at between the petitioner and the complainant.

In the view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 28.12.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the conditions as 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.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

February 07, 2017

Jyoti 1

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No