

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

**CRM-M No.45434 of 2017
Decided on: 24.05.2019**

Amrit Pal Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T., Chandigarh

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Vij, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.373 dated 27.09.2016 registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC at Police Station Sector 17, Chandigarh.

The operative part of the order dated 05.12.2017, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is reproduced as under:-

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is ready to settle the dispute with the complainant- Amanpreet Singh, partner of M/s Omni Impex, Sector-22-C, Chandigarh. He further submits that in order to show bona fide, he is ready to pay an amount of Rs.5 lacs to the complainant. He further submits that the matter may be referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for some amicable settlement between the parties.

The matter is referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 15.12.2017.

The Registry is directed to inform complainant- Amanpreet Singh S/o Avtar Singh, C/o Omni Impex, SCO 2451, Sector-22-C, Chandigarh to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre on that date. The petitioner will bring a demand draft in favour of the complainant of Rs.5 lacs. on the next date of hearing....”

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 05.12.2017, the petitioner has appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner is ready to handed over 15 advance cheques of Rs.1 lac each to be encashed by the complainant every month.

Counsel for the complainant, however, is not agreeing with the said proposal as according to him some more amount is due towards the petitioner.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has not disputed the aforesaid fact and submits that the petitioner is no more required for further investigation.

Considering the fact that this petition is pending since 30.11.2017 when the interim protection was granted to the petitioner and subsequently, the petitioner has paid an amount of Rs.10 lacs during pendency of the present petition, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 05.12.2017 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

24.05.2019
yakub

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