

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SMRITI
2020.02.01 12:16
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CRM-M-19653-2018
Date of Decision: 29.01.2020

Sandeep Kumar

... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. J.S.Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Bhardwaj, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Sulvester, Advocate for
Mr. S.S.Majithia, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

On 10.05.2018, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was only a witness to the sale deed. He has further contended that co-petitioner Sukhwinder Singh Chhina has already been granted interim bail by this Court vide order dated 25.04.2018, passed in Criminal Misc.No.M-16920 of 2018.

Notice of motion for 06.08.2018.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Arresting/Investigating Officer within seven days. On doing so, he shall be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, he shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. failing which he shall lose the benefit of interim bail allowed to him.

To be heard alongwith Criminal Misc.No.M-16920 of 2018”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of order dated 10.05.2018, the petitioner has joined the investigation. He further contends that co-accused, namely, Sukhwinder Singh Chinna, has already been granted bail vide order dated 24.01.2019 passed in CRM-M-16920-2018. The FIR has been registered way back in the year 2015.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the factual position.

In view of the above, the interim order dated 10.05.2018 passed in favour of petitioner is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

29.01.2020
smriti

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether Reportable	: Yes/No