

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

**CRM-M-45155-2019
Date of decision-06.12.2019**

Ved Parkash

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Shelja Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, Advocate for

Mr. Sanjiv Aggarwal, Advocate for the complainant.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Ved Parkash has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.189 dated 01.03.2019 registered under Sections 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City, Panipat. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 26.09.2019.

The FIR was registered on the statement of Gurdeep son of Sh.Roshan Lal wherein it was alleged that he had purchased a car bearing No.HR-06B-1778 from Ved Parkash (petitioner) against total sale consideration of Rs.4,25,000/- and as per agreement, Rs.50,000/- were to be paid to petitioner by the complainant in cash and the remaining amount was to be paid through E.M.I and he also paid two cheques as a security of the payment. The complainant paid the entire instalments in the account of petitioner, thereafter, he asked for No Objection for transfer of vehicle in his

name to which petitioner refused. On these allegations, FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to her, the offences are triable by Magistrate. She submits that investigation of the case is complete and final report stands filed on 25.11.2019, therefore, further custody of the petitioner is not justified.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel assisted by SI Suresh Kumar opposed the prayer. However, it is not disputed that the investigation of the case is complete. It is pointed out that case is fixed for 10.12.2019 for framing of charges.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time and therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be justified, particularly when investigation of the case is complete. Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

06.12.2019

vanita

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No