

212

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

CRM-M-34810 of 2019

Date of decision: November 07, 2019

Balwinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr. P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner, in FIR No.266 dated 09.08.2019, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

On 06.09.2019, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate has filed his power of attorney on behalf of the complainant in the Court today. The same is taken on record.

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready to refund an amount of Rs.1,42,000/- to the complainant, but the same is not acceptable to the complainant.

Adjourned to 07.11.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join

investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of his arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit him to interim bail till the next date of hearing on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner is also directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Ram Karan, has stated that in terms of order dated 06.09.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 06.09.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute, subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off, accordingly.

However, it is made clear that the petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

November 07, 2019
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No