

CRM-M-54825-2018

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

CRM-M-54825-2018

Date of Decision: 13.12.2018

Puran Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Kriteka Sheokand, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 (2) read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2-Akash Verma in case FIR No.464 dated 05.05.2016, registered at Police Station Sadar Gurgaon, Haryana, under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B IPC and Sections 467, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the record.

Vide order dated 10.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-25798-2016 by this Court, respondent No.2 has been granted the benefit of anticipatory bail. The main allegation against respondent No.2 is that he had received amount of ₹73 lakhs, however, had not executed sale deeds of two plots belonging to him. Two cheques amounting to ₹50 lakhs are stated to have

CRM-M-54825-2018

already been bounced. At the time of deciding the petition for anticipatory bail, learned counsel for the petitioner (respondent No.2 herein) in the said petition argued that dispute between the parties was with regard to the breach of agreement and no civil suit had been filed at that time.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not brought any subsequent fact to the knowledge of this Court for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 by this Court more than two years earlier. Learned counsel for the petitioner wanted to argue on the merits of case that bail should be cancelled as the order dated 10.08.2016 was obtained by giving wrong facts before this Court.

However, nothing has been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner as to which facts are wrongly given to this Court and as to why learned counsel for the complainant (petitioner herein) had not pointed the wrong facts at that time.

No ground has been given for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2. Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

13.12.2018

parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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