

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

**Sr. No.203**

**CRM-M-31373-2020**

**Date of decision: 07.12.2020**

Bishan Dutt

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL**

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\* \* \*

**DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)**

Case taken up through video conferencing.

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.107 dated 11.09.2020 registered under Sections 420, 120 IPC at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that the complainant intended to take on lease a marriage palace at Bathinda. In that connection she gave to co-accused Harbans Lal Sharma an amount of Rs.4,00,000/-. However, the said Harbans Lal Sharma, in conspiracy with the petitioner, used that money to execute a lease deed of a property owned by the petitioner in his favour instead of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case; there is no other criminal case in which he is involved; the complainant had given money to Harbans Lal

Sharma to take on lease the land owned by the petitioner; however, Harbans Lal Sharma used that money as his own to get the petitioner's land leased out in his name, the petitioner was not aware of any deal between the complainant and Harbans Lal Sharma; the petitioner acted in good faith on whatever was projected to him by Harbans Lal Sharma; after co-accused Harbans Lal Sharma has compromised the matter with the complainant he has been granted regular bail by this Court and that under the interim orders passed by this Court the petitioner has not only joined the investigation he has also fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jaswinder Singh submits that under the interim orders passed by this Court the petitioner has not only joined the investigation he has also fully co-operated with the investigating agency and that his custodial interrogation is not required by the State.

Keeping in view the totality of the above noticed facts especially the statement made by the learned State counsel that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required, the order of this Court dated 07.10.2020, granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**December 07, 2020**

*Jyoti 1*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No