

205

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.43565 of 2020
Date of Decision: 15.02.2021

RAGHAV @ SONUPetitioner
Vs
STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Shubham Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.479 dated 11.08.2020 registered under Sections 395, 387, 506, 120-B and 325 IPC at Police Station Hansi City, District Hansi, Haryana.

On 23.12.2020, following order was passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-

"Heard through video conferencing.

This is a petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.479 dated 11.08.2020 under

Sections 395, 387, 506, 120-B and 325 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Hansi City, District Hansi, Haryana.

The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner and, in fact, the petitioner has not even been named in the FIR. The learned counsel would further contend that the petitioner was not present at the site of the incident and has been nominated by the co-accused and that the role attributed to him is that he had given his Scooty bearing registration No.HR-21N-4576 to the accused. The learned counsel would further contend that the petitioner had only lent the Scooty to his friend and he was in no way involved in the alleged incident.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana has joined the session through video conferencing and accepts notice on behalf of the sole respondent-State.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI-Satbir Singh, has stated that some amount of money, which was snatched, was given to the petitioner herein and also that the Scooty and the motorcycle arranged by him are yet to be recovered. He has further stated that there is no other case pending against the petitioner.

List on 10.02.2021.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation before the Investigating Officer and would come present as and when called for. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to bail on furnishing adequate surety and personal bonds to the satisfaction of

the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall abide by all the terms and conditions as specified in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

23.12.2020
parkash”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in compliance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation to the entire satisfaction of the Investigating Officer.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Satbir Singh admitted the aforesaid fact and submitted that the petitioner is no more required for further investigation of the case.

Learned counsel for the complainant however opposed the bail on the ground that the petitioner was seen in the CCTV coverage.

Since the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been nominated in the disclosure statement of co-accused, therefore, the interim order dated 23.12.2020 is made absolute. Petitioner shall keep on joining the investigation as and when required to do so and he shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Petition stands disposed of.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 15, 2021
Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No