

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-13006 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.01.2019**

Parveen Singh @ Parveen Kumar Thakur

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Mrs. G.K. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the complainant.

Daya Chaudhary, J.

As per submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the complainant is having remedy under the civil law as there was an agreement to sell between the parties, which was not executed, but no such remedy has been availed.

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the agreement to sell was not executed as the petitioner was inducted in the job because of that agreement to sell and that is why, the complainant did not press his request for execution of sale deed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has joined investigation.

Nothing has been shown to the Court as to whether any such undertaking was there or not or any such understanding was there between the parties. Even it has not been mentioned in the FIR as well. Nothing can

.....

be said in this petition as it is a case for grant of bail. The allegations are matter of evidence, which shall be tested by the trial Court during trial.

Interim order dated 28.03.2018 passed by this Court in favour of the petitioner is made absolute.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

However, the petitioner is directed to join investigation, if required by the Investigating Officer.

11.01.2019
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No