

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

Hemlata  
2018.02.02 17:36  
I attest to the accuracy and  
integrity of this document

**CRM-M-2936-2018(O&M)**

**Date of decision:02.02.2018**

Mahavir Aggarwal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present: Mr. Ajay Ghangas, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Narender Pal Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.1279, dated 26.11.2016, under Sections 380, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Karnal City, Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact, it was a family dispute which was given a colour of criminal litigation. It is further submitted that complainant-Nirmal Aggarwal has two sons, namely Mohit and Rohit. The petitioner has been involved in the present FIR on the disclosure of co-accused Mohit Kumar Aggarwal, who has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.06.2017 passed in CRM-M-21069 of 2017. It is further submitted that three other co-accused namely, Priya Darshni (daughter-in-law of the complainant), Jaipal Jain and Imtiaz Siddiqui have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 28.09.2017 passed in CRM-M-30160 of 2017.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that even co-accused

Mohit has got an FIR registered against the complainant and his brother Rohit and now, the matter has been compromised between the parties.

Learned counsel for the complainant has acknowledged that there is a compromise between the parties.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Manoj Kumar, has not disputed the factual position that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was not mentioned in the disclosure statement of Mohit that he has helped in procuring the digital signature of the complainant. It is further stated that the matter is at an initial stage and the petitioner is no more required for further investigation.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, considering the fact that one of the co-accused has been granted regular bail and three other co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail and the learned counsel for complainant has acknowledged that there is a compromise between the parties and also in view of the fact that the petitioner is in judicial lock up since 11.12.2017 and is no more required for further custodial interrogation; the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail /surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**02.02.2018**

Hemlata

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes / No  
Yes / No