

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

**208**

**CRM-M-1532-2021**

Date of Decision : **April 19, 2022**

**PUNIT SHARMA**

.....Petitioner

***VERSUS***

**STATE OF HARYANA**

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present : Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)**

The present petition is filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.686 dated 19.12.2020 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Sadar, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that vide order dated 13.1.2021 the petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court and in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and has fully cooperated with the investigation process and, therefore, has prayed that the interim order may be confirmed.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel on instructions has stated that it is correct that the petitioner has joined the investigation process in pursuance of the order passed by this Court on 13.1.2021 but

he has not supplied the documents and other relevant material on the basis of which he has fabricated documents for the purpose of applying visa for the complainant.

Replying to the arguments raised by the learned State counsel, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that it is factually incorrect that the petitioner has ever fabricated any document. He referred to Annexures P-7 to P-9 to contend that in the present case an enquiry was conducted three times by the police including Economic Offence Branch and it was found that no offence has been made out in the present case and rather it was advised that the complainant may file a civil suit. He submitted that after the completion of enquiry and the police has come to the conclusion that no offence is made out against the petitioner, therefore, such objection taken by the learned State counsel is not sustainable.

I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

In pursuance to the order passed by this Court on 13.1.2021, the petitioner has joined the investigation as per the learned counsel for the parties. However, the only objection taken by the learned State counsel was that he has not supplied the necessary documents which were required during the course of the investigation. However, a perusal of Annexures P-7, P-8 and P-9 would show that three times the enquiry was conducted and it was found that no offence was made out, it is surprising as to how in the enquiry/investigation it could be concluded that no offence is made out unless all the documents are supplied by the petitioner. Therefore, the argument raised by the learned State counsel is

absolutely not sustainable.

In view of the above, since the petitioner has already joined the investigation, the present petition is allowed and order dated 13.1.2021 is, hereby, made absolute.

April 19, 2022  
ajay-1

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |