

208

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

CRM-M-5449 of 2017

Date of decision: July 04, 2017

Rajpati

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Harish Mehla, Advocate the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Arvinder Arora, Advocate for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties including
learned counsel for the complainant.

In FIR No.324 dated 13.12.2016, under Sections 406, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Chandimandir, Panchkula, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail. This Court had made an order dated 17.02.2017 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Reading of the FIR shows that there is partnership firm of the parties. The grievance of the complainant was that he was not given share by other persons who indulge in forgery etc. In my opinion, prima-facie, dispute being of civil nature, interim order dated 17.02.2017 can be made absolute.

In that view of the matter, interim order dated 17.02.2017

granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made absolute.

Liberty reserved in favour of the complainant to take such steps as available in law.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

July 04, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No