

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

102+220

**CRM-21964-2019 IN/AND
CRM-M-29253-2019
DATE OF DECISION:19.08.2019**

CHANDRA NARAYAN AND ANR

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-21964-2019

This is an application for addition of Sections 467, 468 & 471 IPC in the main petition as well as in the prayer clause.

It is stated in the application that Sections 467, 468 & 471 IPC had been added in the FIR which was not in the knowledge of the petitioners earlier.

Issue notice to the non-applicant/respondent.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/respondent.

In view of the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and Sections 467, 468 & 471 IPC shall be read in the prayer clause as well as in the main petition.

The Registry is directed to carry out the necessary correction.

**CRM-21964-2019 IN/AND
CRM-M-29253-2019**

MAIN CASE

The petitioners are seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 93 dated 08.10.2018 under Sections 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' - for short), registered at Police Station Bakshiwala, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the allegations in the FIR against the petitioners are that they had allegedly taken Rs.5 lacs for installation of solar pumps. He, however, contends that the FIR is the counter-blast to the complaint filed by the petitioners on 06.05.2018, copy whereof is at Annexure P2, with regard to the harassment of the petitioners for the lease money of 75 acres of land in Madhya Pradesh which had been given to the complainant for cultivation @ `22,000/- per acre. He also contends that the petitioners were in U.K. from July, 2018 to January, 2019 for treatment. He further contends that petitioner No. 1 is 70 years of age while petitioner No.2, who is his wife, is 58 years of age. He further contends that the transcript of the conversation between the petitioners and their son with the complainant indicates that the dispute is with regard to the payment of lease money for cultivation of the land in Madhya Pradesh. He has also referred to the copy of the account statement of the complainant at Annexure P6 which indicates that the petitioners have financial dealings in District Hoshangabad (Madhya Pradesh) with regard to agricultural operations.

This Court, by the order dated 12.07.2019, had directed the petitioners to appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation and in the event of their arrest, they were to be released on ad-interim bail to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Mandeep Singh, states that the petitioners have joined investigation and are not required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners and the petitioners having joined investigation, the order dated 12.07.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioners is made absolute.

However, the petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. They shall also join investigation as and when called upon to do so.

The petition stands disposed of.

19.08.2019

SwarnjitS

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

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