

Raj Kumar Arora

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGHPresent: Mr. L.S.Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard via video conference.

On April 23, 2021, the following order had been passed by this

court:-

“Case heard by video conference.

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'anticipatory bail' under the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C., upon FIR No.339, dated 26.12.2019, having been registered at Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 406, 420 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in fact the sons of the complainants had been given work visas to work in Dubai after an offer of appointment was duly obtained for them and only because they found living in Dubai to be very hard, they returned and are now seeking a refund of their money. He further submits that he would place on record the offer of appointment in the petition and also deposit the entire amount of Rs.3.25 Lakh with the learned Area Magistrate, as a pre-condition to remain admitted him on bail.

Notice of motion for 28.05.2021.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. S.S.Deol, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent State.

A copy of the petition be e-mailed to him during the course of the day.

The petitioner would appear before the learned Area Magistrate, Kapurthala/Phagwara within five days and deposit a demand draft for an amount of Rs.3.25 Lakh with

that court and upon such deposit, the learned Area Magistrate would summon the Investigating Officer in the case and ensure that the petitioner is joined in the investigation and if he is sought to be arrested, he shall be released on interim bail, upon his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Duty Magistrate, till the next date of hearing.

In the meantime, counsel for the petitioner would also place on record firm proof of the offer of appointment made to the sons of the complainants, failing which, the interim order would be vacated on the next date of hearing itself.”

Today, though learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the complainant have compromised the matter with each other, there is no compromise deed placed on record, with learned State counsel submitting that, as per his instructions, the petitioner has not even joined investigation, far less deposited any amount of Rs.3.25 lakhs as he was required to deposit.

Upon that statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw this petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn, with the interim order hereby vacated.

September 16, 2021

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES
Whether Reportable : NO