

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

**CRM-M-46327-2021
Date of decision: 15.02.2022**

Dayanand Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Ashok Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

(Through video conferencing)

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 142 dated 04.07.2018, registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Uklana, District Hisar.

The operative part of the order dated 11.11.2021, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is reproduced below:

“Counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant Ishwar stated that in the year 2015, Dayanand Sharma (petitioner herein), Pooja, Rahul and Santosh, came to his house when his nephew and niece were also present and they offered the complainant that they can send him to foreign country on work permit and demanded some amount. It is further submitted that as per the allegations in the FIR, the majority of the amount was paid to co-accused Rahul Sharma and Pooja, who were arrested and later on, they were released on regular bail. It is further submitted that though the FIR pertains to the year 2018, however, he has

only received a notice on 31.07.2021 and thereafter, came to know about the pendency of the present case.

A perusal of the order granting bail to the co-accused would show that they have deposited some amount with the trial Court and the trial qua them has already commenced.

On a Court query, counsel for the State submits that the petitioner was never declared a proclaimed offender as he was not arrested.

Adjourned to 15.02.2022.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, in pursuance to the order dated 11.11.2021, has already appeared before the SHO/Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Mahal Singh, has not disputed the factual position and submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner, vide order dated 11.11.2021, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

15.02.2022

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No