

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

Sr. No. 207

CRM-M-36585-2020

Date of decision : 17.2.2022

RAJIV BHANDARI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. BS Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms.Gunkirat Kaur, AAG, Punjab

Mr.Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the complainant

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.156 dated 19.09.2020 under Section 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Division E, District Amritsar.

On 11.11.2020, this Court had passed the following order: -

“Heard through video conferencing.

This is a petition under section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.156 dated 19.09.2020 under Section 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Division E, District Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the FIR has been lodged after a period of six months. The date of occurrence is alleged to be 12.03.2020 and the FIR has been registered on 19.09.2020.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has joined

the session through video conferencing (VC) and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

Let notice be issued to complainant Saurav Maity, son of Nirmal Maity, House No.3119, Street No.34, Bidanpura, Karol Bagh, Central Delhi.

Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate, appearing through VC, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

List on 11.01.2021.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation before the Investigating Officer and would come present as and when called for. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to bail on furnishing adequate surety and personal bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall abide by all the terms and conditions as specified in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”

Learned State counsel submits that in pursuance to the afore quoted order the petitioner has joined the investigation on several occasions.

Learned counsel for the complainant opposes the present petition. However, for the reasons given in the afore quoted order as also because the petitioner has joined the investigation process on a number of occasions and thus shown his bonafides, this Court is of the opinion that the ad interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner through the order of this Court dated 11.11.2020 be made absolute and it is so ordered.

17.2.2022
gsv

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

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