

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34090-2016
Date of decision:17.1.2018

Anil Kumar Goyal

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Malik, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J. (ORAL)

It is contended that in pursuance of the direction issued by this Court vide order dated 24.9.2016, the petitioner has already deposited an amount of ₹20 lacs and it is also submitted that even prior thereto also he has deposited ₹20 lacs i.e. total 40 lacs.

The above factual aspect is not disputed by learned counsel for the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation in terms of order dated 24.9.2016 passed by this Court and this fact is not disputed by learned State counsel.

There is no dispute that an agreement was executed between the parties and there are certain terms and conditions appended therein and relationships of contracting parties shall be governed thereunder.

In the light of above circumstances, interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 24.9.2016 is made absolute subject to conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, the above observations are not be construed as an expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

Petition stands disposed of.

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

17.1.2018
Gaurav Sorot

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Whether reportable? | No |
| 2. | Whether reasoned / speaking? | No |