

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M-40823-2022
Decided on : 12.12.2022

Samim Ahmad

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Paramjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 73 dated
27.08.2019 under Sections 406, 420, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Section 66-
D of IT Act registered at Police Station Cyber Gurugram.

On 22.11.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following
order:

*“Learned State Counsel has submitted that in spite of
issuance of notice under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C., the
petitioner has not come to join the investigation.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that
there is no interim protection granted in favour of the
petitioner and thus, the petitioner could not appear before
the police officials. It is further submitted that the petitioner
is ready to fully cooperate with the investigation.*

Adjourned to 12.12.2022.

*In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner
shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing*

personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation before the concerned Investigating Officer on 30.11.2022 at 11:00 AM and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in pursuance of the abovesaid order dated 22.11.2022, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further custodial interrogation.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances moreso, the facts which have been noticed in abovesaid order dated 22.11.2022 and also the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further custodial interrogation, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 22.11.2022 is ordered to be made absolute.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

12.12.2022
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No