

209

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

CRM-M-43289 of 2019

Date of decision: November 15, 2019

Arvind Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, 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.305 dated 21.11.2015, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula, Haryana.

On 14.10.2019, while issuing notice of motion, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that there was only an agreement to sell and the petitioner is alleged to be a marginal witness and not a beneficiary. Further contends that even the wrong address was mentioned while initiating the proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C.

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 ASI Rajesh Kumar, has stated that in terms of order dated 14.10.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 14.10.2019 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