

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

CRM-M-42763-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.03.2018

Sandeep Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Saini, AAG, Haryana.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).

This order shall dispose of the instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.439, dated 13.08.2017, under Section 419/420/468/471 IPC, registered at Police Station Thanesar Sadar, District Kurukshetra.

On 07.12.2017, the following order was passed by this Court:

“The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.439 dated 13.08.2017, under Sections 419, 420, 468 & 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Thanesar Sadar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR are that accused-Nitin had been apprehended with forged documents while he had entered the Centre where examination for the post of Assistant Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commissioner was taking place. He further contends that the petitioner is a student and he has

been arraigned as an accused on the disclosure statement of the co-accused- Nitin, who has been released on regular bail.

List on 23.01.2018.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and join investigation.

In the event of his arrest, the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on ad-interim bail subject to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and he shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Naresh Kumar informs the Court that the petitioner has since joined investigation.

That apart, the observations contained in the order dated 07.12.2017 have gone un rebutted.

In view of the above, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be warranted.

Petition is allowed. Order dated 07.12.2017 passed by this Court is made absolute.

26.03.2018

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |