

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

**CRM-M No.33741 of 2018
Decided on: 10.09.2018**

Anmol Goel

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. N.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.69 dated 22.04.2017, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Doraha, District Ludhiana.

The operative part of the order dated 07.08.2018, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is reproduced as under:-

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, complainant Pawan Kumar has alleged that he has entered into an agreement with Ringing Bells Pvt. Ltd., a proprietorship firm. It is further submitted that the petitioner was Manager of the firm and co-accused Sumeer Bajaj has issued a cheque, which was dishonoured on presentation in the bank. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that in fact, the petitioner was never entrusted with any amount by the complainant nor has misappropriated any amount and as per own case of

the complainant, the petitioner was working as Manager.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the main accused Mohit Goel and Samit Kumar, who were arrested, have already been granted the concession of regular bail, whereas Sumeer Bajaj, who allegedly handed over the cheque to the complainant, has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 03.05.2018 passed by this Court passed in CRM-M-10625-2018.

Notice of motion for 10.09.2018....”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 07.08.2018, the petitioner has already appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Hardam Singh, has not disputed the aforesaid fact and submits that the petitioner is no more required for further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 07.08.2018 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

10.09.2018
yakub

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