

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

Decided on: 14.03.2019

1. CRM-M No.5047 of 2018 (O&M)

Satpal Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

2. CRM-M No.782 of 2018 (O&M)

Atma Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

3. CRM-M No.5118 of 2018 (O&M)

Tarlok Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Ms. Shuchi Sodhi, Advocate
for Mr. Animesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in all the petitions)

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Chahal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.

The petitioners namely Satpal Singh, Atma Singh and
Tarlok Singh, pray for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.302 dated
20.11.2017 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian

Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

The operative part of the order dated 11.01.2018 passed in CRM-M No.782 of 2018, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner – Atma Singh, is reproduced as under:-

“...Counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR has been registered by the complainant with the allegations that the petitioner and others have taken the money on the pretext of locating gold underneath his land. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that in fact the complainant has not disclosed the fact that there was an agreement to sell dated 13.07.2017 and the dispute is with regard to this agreement.

Notice of motion for 18.04.2018....”

Thereafter, similar order has been passed by this Court in CRM-M Nos.5047 and 5118 of 2018 and interim anticipatory bail has also been granted to the petitioners namely Satpal Singh and Tarlok Singh.

Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 11.01.2018 and 15.02.2018, the petitioners have appeared before the Investigating Officer and have joined the investigation more than one occasion and they are no more required for further investigation.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has not disputed the aforesaid fact, however, submits that the recovery of money is to be effected from the petitioner.

Counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, has submitted that though the petitioners have represented that they are

ready to settle the dispute before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, however, they have failed to arrived at any settlement before the Mediator, therefore, the bail application of all the petitioners be dismissed.

After hearing the counsel for the parties and in view of the submissions made by counsel for the parties, these petitions are allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners namely Satpal Singh, Atma Singh and Tarlok Singh, vide orders dated 11.01.2018 and 15.02.2018 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

14.03.2019
yakub

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