

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

CRM-M-35888-2021

Date of decision : 20.05.2022

Vasisth Kumar Verma

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Prabhdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Bijender Dhankhar, Advocate for the complainant.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner has approached this Court under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure to seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No.53 dated 02.02.2019 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat, who apprehends his arrest at the hands of Police.

On 02.09.2021, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned senior counsel contends that pursuant to the family settlement dated 03.04.2017, the petitioner being Director of M/s A.M. India Mart had agreed to part away from the said company and in lieu of that, a sum of Rs.40 lacs was to be paid to the petitioner. He submits that on 05.04.2017, petitioner's resignation was accepted and a sum of Rs.40 lacs was received by him on 05.06.2017. He submits that as per allegations, complainant Atul Kaushik had given an amount of Rs.2 crores to M/s A.M. India Mart for franchisee of a retail outlet to be set up at Faridabad and according to him, when the said payment was made on 15.05.2017 and 17.05.2017, all the Directors of the company were present. It is the case of the learned counsel that the alleged transaction took

place between the complainant and the company in 2017 and the FIR has been lodged after a long delay and that too after the retail outlet opened by the complainant could not pick up any business and was closed. He submits that in the given facts, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be necessary. Notice of motion for 13.12.2021. Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that in compliance of the above order, the petitioner associated himself in the investigation and cooperated during interrogation.

Learned State counsel who is instructed by SI Jeet Singh states that indeed the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation for the time being.

Considering above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 02.09.2021 is made absolute.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

20.05.2022
vanita

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