

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

CRM No. M-4750 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.05.2017.

Tej Pratap Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. A.G.S.Dhillon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shivali, AAG Punjab
assisted by ASI Karnail Singh.

Complainant-Manjit Singh in person.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.88 dated
18.06.2016 registered under Section 420 IPC and Section 36(1) of
Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995 at Police Station
Sadar, District Patiala.

On 15.02.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant,
namely, Manjit Singh, son of Banta Singh, resident of Village
Bahadargarh, Police Station Sadar Samana, District Patiala, is
ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Registry is directed to amend the memo of parties accordingly.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is ready and willing to execute the sale deed.

Notice of motion for 16.03.2017.

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 15.02.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation. It is further asserted that during the interregnum period, the parties have entered into settlement. Respondent No.2 duly identified by the I.O admits the factum of compromise that he has received the entire amount and he has no objection in case the present petition is allowed.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

In view of above, the order dated 15.02.2017 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to furnishing of bail-

bonds/surety bonds by the petitioner to the satisfaction of the
CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

24.05.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No