

Surender

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Ajay Kalra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard by video conference.

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'anticipatory bail', upon FIR no.189, dated 20.04.2020, having been registered at Police Station City Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 420/467/ 468/471/34 of the IPC.

After the petitioner had been admitted to interim bail by this court vide an order dated 10.02.2021, on the last date of hearing, i.e. 26.07.2021, the following order was passed by this court:-

“Pursuant to the order dated 10.02.2021, the petitioner is stated to have joined investigation even as per the instructions of learned State counsel, who however submits that it being an 'economic offence', the specimen signatures of the petitioner are required.

Whereas I failed to understand why the authentic specimen signatures could not be obtained from the bank that he is a customer with, yet, since the investigating officer is wanting his current signatures, adjourned to 03.09.2021, with the petitioner directed to provide his specimen signatures to the investigating officer as and when summoned by him.

Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing only and

specifically.”

First, it is to be noticed that it has been erroneously stated by this court that the petitioner is a customer with the bank concerned, whereas actually he is an official employed with the complainant bank.

Be that as it may, learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the petitioner has now submitted his specimen signatures and presently at least his custodial interrogation is not required.

That being so, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, this petition has actually been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

However, if the petitioners' custodial interrogation is required at any stage hereinafter, in the context of the FIR in question, he would be given 10 days notice before arrest, duly shown to be served upon him.

Naturally, if the complainant is aggrieved in any manner, of lack of proper investigation, he would be always at liberty to avail of his remedy as per law.

September 13, 2021

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES
Whether Reportable : NO