

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(202)

CRM-M-430-2022

Date of decision: - 10.02.2022

Sandeep

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is the first petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.209 dated 06.05.2021, under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat.

On 10.01.2022, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 209 dated 06.05.2021, under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged that the petitioner had made a WhatsApp group and was informing the vehicle owners about location of the RTA staff conducting checking.

He, however, contends that there is no material on record which would connect the petitioner with the alleged commission of offence.

Issue notice to the respondent.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

List on 10.02.2022.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the investigating/arresting officer and join investigation. In the event of his arrest, the investigating/arresting officer shall release the petitioner on ad interim bail subject to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Om Parkash, have submitted that in pursuance of the above order, the petitioner has joined the investigation on 29.01.2022 and is not required for further investigation.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further investigation, the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is allowed and the interim order dated 10.01.2022 is made absolute.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

February 10, 2022
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No