

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25579-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 31.03.2021

Pal Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

CRM-29196-2020

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed and reply to the bail application on behalf of the complainant along with Annexures is taken on record.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-25579-2020

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.694 dated 20.08.2020 under Section 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station City Panipat, District Panipat.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was

passed by this Court on 02.09.2020: -

“...Counsel for the petitioner has argued that a civil suit is already pending between the parties with regard to a licence of a wood based industry i.e. Aara (saw mill) of the complainant. It is further submitted that the petitioner has obtained the said licence and later on, he has entered into an agreement of sale with Gaurav and Abhishek and on that account, the petitioner has even given the cheques of return of amount. It is also submitted that the petitioner is not dealing in any such business of sending the persons abroad and the allegations have been made only to convert the civil dispute in a criminal litigation...”

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.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation. However, it is submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case, in which he is on bail.

Learned counsel for the complainant has filed the reply and primary objection raised in the reply is that the amount was not paid for the sale of the saw mill and rather it was for sending the son of the complainant abroad.

Be whatsoever, it is admitted case of learned State counsel that the petitioner has joined the investigation, however, only objection raised by him is that the amount is to be recovered from the petitioner.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the

fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and it is not for the police to recover the amount, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 02.09.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

31.03.2021
vishnu

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No