

208

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

CRM-M-42434 of 2019

Date of decision: November 15, 2019

Sukhbir

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Mohit Trikha, Advocate for
Mr. Jitender Dhanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, DAG Haryana.

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.47 dated 20.02.2019, under Sections 420, 419, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Urban Estate Hisar, District Hisar.

On 03.10.2019, while issuing notice of motion, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that as per the allegation in the FIR, it is co-accused Sumit who has used some electronic device in connivance with other persons at the time of giving examination for the post of Messenger in LUVAS and the petitioner has nothing to do with the same. Further contends that co-accused of the petitioner i.e. Rakesh Kumar and Gurdeep Dass have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion for 15.11.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the 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 SI Tejpal, has stated that in terms of order dated 03.10.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 03.10.2019 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 15, 2019
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No