

209

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

CRM-M-16979 of 2019

Date of decision: September 20, 2019

Amit Soori

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Kulwant Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Multani, AAG Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr. P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner, in FIR No.168 dated 22.09.2018, under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station PAU, Ludhiana.

On 23.05.2019, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that on account of same very allegations for embezzlement of ₹ 44,000/-, petitioner has already been terminated from services by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Ludhiana (M) Division. Further contends that before the Disciplinary Authorities, petitioner has even deposited the amount in question and thus, lodging of FIR is questionable.

Adjourned to 09.08.2019 for further consideration.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of

his arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit him to interim bail in the present case till the next date of hearing on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner is also directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Assistant Sub Inspector Richand Masih, has stated that in terms of order dated 23.05.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 23.05.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off, accordingly.

However, it is made clear that the petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

September 20, 2019

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No