

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

**CRM-M-29092-2017
Date of decision: 19.12.2018**

Anil Galav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. S. K. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

None for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 227 dated 29.06.2017, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of the IPC at Police Station Sadar Jind, District Jind.

The operative part of the order dated 31.10.2017, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while dismissing the application, the learned Sessions Judge has observed that the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender in another FIR bearing No. 53, dated 05.04.2012 under Sections 379, 420, 467, 468 IPC. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the order dated 09.10.2017, passed in CRM-M-37788-2017, vide which the petitioner was directed to appear before the trial court and the trial Court was directed to admit in interim bail on his furnishing personal bail bond and surety bond. Vide Annexure P-6, the trial Court has already accepted the bail bond/ surety bond

in that case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR has been registered on the pretext of a money dispute between the petitioner; one Ramphal, who is stated to be a close relative of the complainant and the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he has already refunded an amount of Rs.1,50,000/- by way of cheque and Rs.90,000/- by way of cash, deposit in the account of Sandeep. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready to settle the dispute with the complainant and to pay back the entire amount. Notice of motion for 06.12.2017.”

Thereafter, the matter was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and a settlement was arrived at between the parties that the petitioner will pay a total amount of Rs. 60,000/- to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has made the entire payment as settled.

The aforesaid fact is not disputed by learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Atma Ram.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 31.10.2017, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

December 19, 2018

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No