

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

**CRM-M No.50320 of 2021 (O&M)
Decided on: 16.03.2022**

Harjinder Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. S.K. Garg Narwana, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Vazir Singh Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Puri, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 198 dated 07.09.2021, registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

The operative part of the order dated 02.12.2021, vide which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner, is reproduced as under:-

“....Learned senior counsel, appearing for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner never acted as a Director of D. S. G. M. Multimarketing India Pvt. Ltd. and there is no allegation in the FIR that any amount was entrusted to the petitioner.

Learned senior counsel has relied upon a list of Directors of D. S. G. M. Multimarketing India Pvt. Ltd. to submit that two persons, namely Shivaniben Bhargavabhai

Pandya and Bhargavabhai Pravinchandra Pandya, are the owners of the said company.

It is further submitted that the memorandum of understanding, relied upon by the complainant, is in fact signed by one of the aforesaid persons and not by the petitioner.

Learned senior counsel further submits that on two earlier occasions, similar complaint was given by the complainant; one to DSP, Dera Bassi and another to SSP, Mohali and in the investigation conducted, in the first complaint, it was found that it was a money dispute and no criminal case is made out and in the second complaint, it was found that the entire transaction took place at Surat and not at Mohali.

Notice of motion for 09.03.2022....”

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 02.12.2021, the petitioner has appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Bhupinder Singh, has not disputed the aforesaid fact and submits that the petitioner is no more required for further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 02.12.2021 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

16.03.2022

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No