

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

235

CRM-M-28086-2021

Date of Decision: 18.08.2021

Rohit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Mohan Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Vinod Kumar.

Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate, for the complainant.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.344 dated 04.06.2021 at Police Station City Palwal, District Palwal, under Sections 406/420/120-B IPC (Section 379-A IPC added later on).
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Dayachand, wherein it is alleged that on 31.05.2021, when he was proceeding towards Delhi on his motor-cycle, then he was waylaid by 6/7 persons, who came in a car and a motorcycle and while initially they disclosed that they are police officials, but later they told him that they are from Bajaj Finance Company and that his one installment is due and asked him to deposit Rs.10,000/- into an account, which the petitioner accordingly deposited. It is also stated that another amount of Rs.9500/- was also deposited and

when later another demand of Rs.20,000/- was raised, he came to know that a fraud had been committed on him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the FIR came to be lodged under some misunderstanding and the same has been resolved and that the complainant has no objection for grant of bail to the petitioner.
4. Learned State counsel has, however, opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and specific allegations have been levelled against him. It has, however, been informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 months.
5. Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate, who is representing the complainant, has endorsed the factum of compromise and has stated that he has no objection for grant of bail to the petitioner.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case wherein the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 months and the matter is stated to have been compromised, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial will take some time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

18.08.2021

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**
Whether reportable: **Yes/No**