

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

CRM-M No.27027 of 2018

Date of Decision: 17.01.2019

Nirmal Singh Pawla

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Ms. Rashmi Attri, A.A.G., Punjab.
Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of order dated 02.07.2018, the petitioner has joined the investigation and this fact has been affirmed by learned State counsel.

However, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that recovery has not been effected. In the FIR, only the name has been mentioned but nowhere, it has been mentioned that the amount was paid to him.

A written document stated to be signed by the petitioner is there but the same has not been got compared and it cannot be said that the writing thereupon is of the petitioner or not. It will be proved by way of evidence before the trial Court.

Since the petitioner has joined the investigation and two more cases of the similar nature are there, wherein, he is stated to be on bail, the interim order dated 02.07.2018 passed in his favour is made absolute.

The petition is disposed of accordingly.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

17.01.2019

gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No