

206.

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

CRM-M-50927-2019

Date of Decision: 24.08.2021

(Heard through VC)

MANOJ KUMAR @ MOJU

.... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.250 dated 03.10.2019 registered under Sections 354 (D)(2), 376(2)(N), 384/34 of IPC at Police Station Sadar Narwana, District Jind.

2. By an order dated 17.01.2020, this Court had granted interim bail to the petitioner and directed him to join investigation.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would contend that pursuant to the order dated 17.01.2020 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined investigation.

4. The aforesaid fact is confirmed by learned counsel for the respondent-State. He would submit that challan in the case has already been

presented against the co-accused and will be presented against the petitioner herein.

5. At the moment, counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant would object by stating that the provisions of IT Act have not been invoked against the petitioner herein.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. In view of the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation, the instant petition is allowed and the order dated 17.01.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

8. Any grievance that the complainant has against the non-adding of the provisions of IT Act, he has a remedy which he can avail in accordance with law.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

24.08.2021

sanjeev	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable:	Yes/No