

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SMRITI
2020.01.13 17:26
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CRM-M-40062-2019
Date of Decision: 13.01.2020

Rameshwar

... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S.Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR
No.191 dated 10.08.2019 registered at Police Station Sadar, Narnaul,
District Mohindergarh.

On 19.09.2019, the following order was passed:-

*“The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR
No.191 dated 10.08.2019, under Sections 420, 467, 468
and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at
Police Station Sadar Narnaul, District Mohindergarh.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that
the allegations against the petitioner are that he has
forged the school leaving certificate and changed his
date of birth from 07.10.1957 to 07.10.1967. He also
contends that the school after due verification had issued
the certificate on 12.04.2016 certifying that the date of
birth of the petitioner is indeed 07.10.1967. He also
contends that the petitioner is ready to undergo
ossification test. He further contends that the petitioner
is working as a class IV employee and has rendered 17
years of service and the instant FIR has been lodged at
the behest of the Principal of the school as a counter-*

blast to the writ petition, i.e. CWP No. 15967 of 2018, preferred by the petitioner for continuation in service wherein this Court had allowed him to continue his service in the school. He further contends that all the documents are in the custody of the police and no recovery is to be made from the petitioner.

Issue notice to the respondent returnable on 18.10.2019.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the investigating/arresting officer and join investigation.

In the event of his arrest, the investigating/arresting officer shall release the petitioner on ad interim bail subject to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

It has been stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that in terms of abovesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and nothing has to be recovered from him. The case of the petitioner mainly hinges upon documentary evidence which is already in the custody of Investigating Agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Head Constable Vijender, has not disputed the factual position.

In view of the above, the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 19.09.2019 is made absolute.

Disposed of.

13.01.2020
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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