

206
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-44882-2021
Date of Decision: 22.04.2022**

Inderjeet Gupta

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. P.S. Sullar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate, for the complainant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 215 dated 11.05.2016, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a case where there has been a delay of about 30 years in lodging of the present FIR and even otherwise also the entire case was based upon documentary evidence which is already in the possession of the police. He further submitted that other co-accused namely Prem Nath Gupta has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CRM-M-14141-

2021 vide Annexure P-19. He further submitted that the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 29.10.2021 when notice of motion was issued and thereafter, the petitioner has joined the investigation and he has fully cooperated with the investigation process and has therefore prayed that the interim bail may be confirmed.

On the other hand, Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has stated that an affidavit has been filed in the present case and while referring to para No.7 of the affidavit he has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and has cooperated with the investigation process and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.

Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate has also appeared on behalf of the complainant and has opposed the grant of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

It has been specifically stated in the affidavit that in pursuance of the orders passed by this Court the petitioner has joined investigation and has cooperated with the investigation process and as per the learned State counsel the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the aforesaid position, the present petition is allowed. The order dated 29.10.2021 is hereby made absolute.

22.04.2022

rakesh

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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