

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37845-2020 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 13.05.2022

Kuldeep Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present: Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Devender Kumar, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.588 dated 05.11.2019 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Palwal, District Palwal.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 15.12.2020: -

*“...Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Manish Sharma has gone abroad. The stand of the petitioner is that Manish Sharma and Bhagat Singh entered into some understanding with*

*the petitioner in respect of installation of petrol pump till December, 2017 and received a total sum of Rs.22 lakhs. Out of the aforesaid amount, Manish Sharma had returned an amount of Rs.10,42,100/-, but did not return the remaining amount for which a cheque was issued, which was not honoured by the bank. A suit for recovery dated 02.12.2019 at the instance of the petitioner is pending before the trial Court. Manish Sharma had gone abroad even before filing of the complaint, on the basis of which the present FIR has been registered.*

*Learned State counsel seeks time to verify the aforesaid facts and apprise this Court about the status of Manish Sharma. It may also be verified and submitted by way of affidavit of the Investigating Officer, whether Manish Sharma and Bhagat Singh had taken money from different candidates for the purpose of giving the same to the petitioner. How many candidates had contributed the amount and what was the mode of payment received from these candidates/ persons... ”*

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that there is no complaint that in the intervening period of one and half year, the petitioner has either misused the concession of interim bail or extended any threat to the witnesses or tried to influence them, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 15.12.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

It will be open for the Investigating Officer to issue an advance notice in writing to the petitioner, if he is still required for the purpose of further investigation.

13.05.2022  
*vishnu*

**[ ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN ]**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No