

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

CRM No. M-60 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 18.04.2017.

Sandeep @ Sonu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sunil Garg, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 207 dated
13.12.2016 registered under Sections 379, 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at
Police Station Sadar Kaithal.

On 10.01.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the alleged theft occurred on
21.11.2016 whereas the FIR was registered on 13.12.2016. The
complainant in fact, after announcement of demonetization scheme
by the Government of India, wanted to get the cash amount held by
him exchanged through the co accused who is brother-in-law of the
complainant and Sahil who is also a relative of the complainant.
There is no allegation against the petitioner regarding receipt of any
amount.

Notice of motion for 07.03.2017.

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 10.01.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation. He further states that cancellation report in the matter has already been prepared.

In view of above, the order dated 10.01.2017 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.

18.04.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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