

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

217-4

**CRM-M-51206-2019
Date of decision: 19.12.2019**

Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Ravi Sodhi, Advocate and
Mr. M. M. Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagmohan Ghuman, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ramender Chauhan, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR
No. 0057 dated 14.10.2019, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468 and
471 of the IPC at Police Station Industrial Area, Bhiwani, District Bhiwani.

The order dated 02.12.2019, vide which the petitioner has been
granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner Sonu was not named in the FIR and even
otherwise, he was only dealing with the evaluation of old
cars for the purpose of sale and purchase of the same at
M/s Raghu Hyundai, Bhiwani.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits
that the petitioner is later on named on the disclosure of
main accused Gaurav Soni.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana and Mr.

Ramender Chauhan, Advocate, who are present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant, respectively.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jitender Singh, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer of the petitioner on the ground that in a series of disclosures made by main accused Gaurav Soni, he has named the petitioner as one of the accused.

In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a perusal of disclosure statement dated 04.11.2019 would show that some names are mentioned, however, the name of the petitioner is not there.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that in the second disclosure, Gaurav Soni has stated that he had given some amount to his friends by transferring the same from his mobile phone to their accounts, however, he did not know the account details and in another disclosure, Gaurav Soni has given details of some cash lying with him.

Learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that the name of the petitioner was not referred in the FIR because at that stage, even the complainant was not aware as to how much embezzlement was done and later on he came to know about the same.

List again on 19.12.2019.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, in pursuance to the order dated 02.12.2019, has already appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined investigation

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Ram Niwas, has not disputed the factual position and submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for any further

investigation.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 02.12.2019, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

19.12.2019

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No