

208

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

(1) CRM-M-21363-2022
Date of decision:13.07.2022

MUKTA GUPTA ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

(2) CRM-M-22564-2022

RADHA KANT GUPTA AND ANOTHER ...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

(3) CRM-M-22567-2022

PANKAJ GUPTA ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present: Mr. Gourav Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in all cases)

Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gautam Dutta, Advocate
for complainant (in CRM-M-21363-2022).

Mr. Sahil Gupta, Advocate
for complainant
(in CRM-M-22564-2022 & CRM-M-22567-2022)

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

All the three bail petitions cast under Section 438 Cr.P.C., are being
disposed of through a common order, as they arise from a common FIR.

2. In FIR No.83 of 11.04.2022, registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana, offences constituted under Sections 420, 467, 468, 120-B of IPC, are embodied.

3. Through orders made respectively, on 18.05.2022, on 24.05.2022, and, on 25.05.2022, upon bail petitions (supra), this Court had granted ad-interim bail to the present bail petitioner(s). Moreover, since this Court had, after the making of analyses of the incriminations, drawn against the accused, had concluded that, *prima-facie* the dispute engaging the complainant, and, the accused was primarily a civil dispute, therefore, it had for ensuring that, an amicable settlement occurs amongst them, hence directed the litigants concerned, to make their respective appearance(s) before the Mediation, and, Conciliation Centre of this Court. The above appearances was directed to be made on 27.05.2022.

4. The Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, has submitted its report, before this Court with an intimation that, a settlement has occurred amongst the complainant, and, the accused. The reading(s) of the memorandum of understanding appended with the report, and, to which Annexure A is assigned, reveals that, it has been signed by the victim(s)-complainant(s) as well as by all the accused-petitioner(s).

5. Since an amicable settlement of the petition FIR dispute, has occurred amongst the victim(s)-complainant(s), and, the petitioners, thereupon this Court does not deem it fit, and, appropriate to either decline the craved for indulgence of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner(s), and, also does not deem it fit, and, appropriate to order for their custodial interrogation.

6. Moreover, also when no evidence has been adduced by the prosecution, suggestive that in the event of anticipatory bail being granted to the

present bail petitioner(s), there is every likelihood of theirs fleeing from justice, and/or, tampering with the prosecution evidence, and/or, influencing the prosecution witnesses.

7. In summa the orders as made, by this Court respectively, on 18.05.2022, on 24.05.2022, and, on 25.05.2022, are made absolute on the same terms and conditions, and, also subject to theirs respectively furnishing before the investigating officer concerned, personal, and, surety bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- each, and, to the satisfaction of the investigating officer concerned, and, also subject to theirs not tampering with prosecution evidence, and, besides theirs not influencing prosecution witnesses, and, also theirs making the fullest co-operation to the investigating officer concerned, as, and, when required to be rendering their co-operation.

13.07.2022

ithlesh

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No