

CRM-M-8500 of 2018

{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-8500 of 2018
Date of decision:08.07.2021

Vikramjeet Sheriya

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. R.K.Chanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate
for the complainant-Bank.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

This is the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.48 dated 18.03.2015 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Division No.1, Pathankot.

On 17.04.2018, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire loan amount has now been deposited with the bank and nothing is due towards the petitioner. He has placed on record photocopy of bank draft No.293157 dated 6.3.2018 for ₹ 4 lacs and

another bank draft No.293156 dated 6.3.2018 for ₹ 4 lacs and further submits that these amounts have been encashed.

Learned State counsel prays for time to file status report.

List on 23.8.2018.

Keeping in view the above, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the police and join investigation within a week. In the event of his arrest being required, he shall be released on ad interim bail subject to his furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Officer. However, he shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Code of Criminal Procedure failing which he shall lose the benefit of interim bail allowed to him.”

In pursuance to the orders passed by this Court, State has filed two separate status reports dated 21.08.2018 and 09.01.2020.

Upon instructions from ASI Bodh Raj, State counsel submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation. He has further instructions to submit that the petitioner is not named in any other criminal case.

Counsel appearing for the complainant-Bank has made a categorical statement that no compromise has been effected between the Bank and the petitioner and some amount is still recoverable from the petitioner.

In view of the above facts, but without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 17.04.2018 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject

to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

July 08, 2021
savita

<i>Whether Speaking/Reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>