

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

CRM-M No.43544 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.03.2019

Pritpal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Mridul Chhabra and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Mr. Karambir Singh Nalwa and Mr. A.S.Thind, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. C.L.Pawar, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.2/State.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in Complaint Case No.4038 dated 27.04.2016, under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, titled as “Mridul Chhabra Vs. Pritpal Singh”.

This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 17.11.2017, passed the following order:-

“ Notice of motion returnable on 15.01.2018.

In the event of arrest, petitioner shall be released on ad interim anticipatory bail in complaint case No.4038 dated 27.04.2016, under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 titled as “Mridul Chhabra Versus Pritpal Singh”, on furnishing of his bail bonds amounting to ₹ 10,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer. Petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when

required and fully cooperate with the Investigating/Arresting Officer. Petitioner shall abide by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. ”

It is contended by learned Counsel for the petitioner that in pursuance of the above order, petitioner has already joined the proceedings before learned trial Court and continuously appearing there till date.

The aforesaid factual position is duly acknowledged by learned Counsel for respondent No.1.

In view of above, interim order dated 17.11.2017 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. and the present petition stands disposed off.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall fully co-operate with the learned trial Court and would not repeat such lapse(s) in future.

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

March 25, 2019

Gagan

**(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>