

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

**CRM-M-30828-2018
Date of decision: 15.10.2018**

Meenakshi Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. M. S. Nagra, AAG, Punjab.

None for respondent Nos. 2 to 7.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 225 dated 25.11.2015, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar City, District Jalandhar.

The operative part of the order dated 23.07.2018, vide which the petitioners have been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“As per allegations in the FIR, the primary dispute between the parties is with regard to an agreement to sell pertaining to the year 2007, in which the stipulated date for registration of the sale deed was fixed as 30.05.2009. The present FIR has been registered after a lapse of about 07 years and in the intervening period, even the period of limitation for enforcing the aforesaid agreement has also lapsed. Petitioners have relied upon the affidavit (Annexure P-2), in which the complainant has shown his inclination for settling the dispute regarding some money transaction. A perusal of the orders (Annexure P-7 colly.) passed by the

Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar shows that the anticipatory bail application filed by petitioner No.1 remained pending for a considerable long time and in the intervening period, there were talks for compromise and even the statement of power of attorney of the complainant was also recorded. Notice of motion for 15.10.2018.”

As per Office report, private respondents stand served, however, there is no representation on their behalf.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, in pursuance to the order dated 23.07.2018, have already appeared before the SHO/Investigating Officer and have joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from HC Sukhpreet Singh, has not disputed the factual position and submits that the petitioners have joined the investigation and are no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners, vide order dated 23.07.2018, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

October 15, 2018

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No