

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

**CRM-M No. 26381 of 2019
Date of decision: 29.10.2019.**

Surinder Kumar

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Nand Lal Sammi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has sought cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No. 4 - Prince Kumar @ Prince Madan in case FIR No.0102 dated 10.05.2019, under Sections 406, 420, 454 and 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as an amount of ₹49,000/- had been paid by the petitioner to respondent No. 4 - Prince Kumar @ Prince Madan, he could not have been granted anticipatory bail.

Heard.

It is apparent from the perusal of the order granting anticipatory bail to respondent No. 4 - Prince Kumar @ Prince Madan that the dispute had taken place due to violation of conditions for execution of the sale deed. The main accused, namely, Dalip Kumar had been arrested by the police. It was also observed that violation of the conditions of sale as well as recovery

of the amount has to be determined by the Civil Court. There is nothing on record which would suggest that respondent No. 4 - Prince Kumar @ Prince Madan has in any manner misused the conditions of the anticipatory bail. Therefore, I do not find any manifest illegality in the impugned order granting anticipatory bail to respondent No. 4 - Prince Kumar @ Prince Madan.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

29.10.2019
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No