

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

**219**

\*\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M No. 33333 of 2019  
Date of decision : 16.11.2019**

**Azad**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana**

**.....Respondent**

**Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT**

Present :     Mr. Mohit Rathee, Advocate, for the petitioner  
                  Mr. M.K. Sangwan, DAG, Haryana

---

**Rajbir Sehrawat, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 512 dated 25.10.2018, registered under Sections 120B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 506 IPC at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat.

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the name of the petitioner has been wrongly involved in this case. Still further, it is submitted that even during the investigation, the police have not been able to collect any evidence, whatsoever, to connect the petitioner to the crime as alleged against him, except the disclosure statement of one of the co-accused. However, even that co-accused has already been granted bail by the learned trial Court. Otherwise, the allegations are pertaining to execution of a sale deed; by impersonating the actual owner. But even as per the allegations, the petitioner is not named either as the signatory to the sale deed in any manner, whatsoever, nor a beneficiary under the said sale deed.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, being instructed

by the police official, submits that the disclosure statement has been duly made against the petitioner that the co-accused had taken the money in his bank account and after withdrawing that amount, the same was handed over to the present petitioner. However, beyond that the investigating file does not contain even any indication that money might have gone to the petitioner. Even the learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that in the disclosure statement of the co-accused, there is nothing against the petitioner as such except the bald allegation that money was later on given to the petitioner.

In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail. Therefore, it is directed that in case of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer subject to his furnishing bail bonds/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer. However, it is further directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Officer. He shall further comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

**(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

**16.11.2019**

*Ashwani*

|                   |   |        |
|-------------------|---|--------|
| Speaking/Reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Reportable        | : | Yes/No |