

In virtual Court

CRM-M-24352-2021

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24352-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.09.2021

Chhinderpal Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.189 dated 06.09.2020 under Sections 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Fazilka, District Fazilka.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 30.06.2021: -

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was registered at the instance of one Sanjeev Kumar, a commission agent, with the allegations that he had filed a suit for recovery against the petitioner, which was decreed in his favour and during the execution of said proceedings, when Bailiff of the Court had gone to attach tractor of the petitioner, he did not allow the same and later on, had sold the tractor to some other person. It is

further submitted that in fact, the tractor was financed by Tata Finance Company and on account of petitioner's inability to pay the installments, the same was repossessed by Tata Finance Company and was sold to recover the amount. It is also submitted that in order to show his bonafide and to settle the dispute with the complainant, the petitioner is ready to deposit an amount of Rs.1.50 lac with the executing Court, where the execution application filed by complainant Sanjeev Kumar is pending, within a period of two months from today..."

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation. It is further submitted that the matter has been settled between the parties and the petitioner has already paid Rs.1.50 lacs to the complainant.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Bhagwan Chand, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 30.06.2021 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

29.09.2021
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No