

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of decision : 07.01.2022

1. CRM-M-53678-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-53646-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

3. CRM-M-53649-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

4. CRM-M-53652-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

5. CRM-M-53653-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent

6. CRM-M-53655-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent

7. CRM-M-53663-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent

8. CRM-M-53667-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent

9. CRM-M-53672-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

10. CRM-M-53696-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

11. CRM-M-53718-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

12. CRM-M-53722-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

13. CRM-M-53780-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

14. CRM-M-53787-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

15. CRM-M-53794-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

16. CRM-M-53866-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

17.

CRM-M-53664-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

18.

CRM-M-53685-2021(O&M)

Virender Bagai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.A.S.Bhullar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This common order shall dispose of the aforesaid 18 petitions filed under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner Virender Bagai. The said petitions are the second regular bail petitions filed by the petitioner Virender Bagai.

A detailed chart showing the detail of the case number, FIR no., Name of the Complainant, Serial Number shown of each complainant in order dated 06.01.2021 passed in Execution Proceedings, which are still

pending and the amount deposited by each complainant as per the allegation in the FIR has been compiled herein below. The said chart has been divided into two parts, the first part i.e., Part A, being with respect to Complainants approaching the HRERA Authority and the second part i.e., Part B, showing the details of the complainants who have approached the State Commission.

“CHART

Virender Bagai versus State of Haryana

That out of the 18 FIRs registered against the petitioner under Section 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, the complainants in 14 cases have approached the HRERA and 04 have approached the State Commission.

A. The details of the complainants approaching the HRERA and the amount deposited by them are mentioned here in below:-

Case No.	FIR No.	Complainant Name	Name of the complainant mentioned in the order dated 06.01.2021 (Passed by HRERA)	Amount Deposited (in Rs)	Year of Agreement
CRM-M-53646/21	119/04.08.2019	Shyam Sunder Bagai	The complainant was ordered refund by the HRERA vide complaint no. 938/2019, however no execution has been filed.	35,26,016.00	2011
CRM-M-53649/21	125/13.08.2019	Punam Mahajan	Page No. 45, Serial No. 22	66,07,221.00	2011
CRM-M-53652/21	145/29.08.2019	Shiv Rattan Goel	Page No. 41, Serial No. 04	53,96,971.00	2011
CRM-M-53653/21	140/27.08.2019	Jyotsna Leekha	Page No. 44, Serial No. 01	61,39,755.00	2011
CRM-M-53667/21	139/26.08.2019	Subash Chandra Dhaiya	Page No. 43, Serial No. 07	35,91,700.00	2006
CRM-M-53672/21	114/31.07.2019	Gurcharan S. Baidwan	Page No. 45, Serial No. 06	62,59,746.00	2011
CRM-M-53678/21	204/30.12.2019	Amrish K. Bansal	Page No. 46, Serial No. 26	58,39,069.00	2011
CRM-M-53696/21	135/22.08.2019	Umesh Bassi	Page No. 43, Serial No. 23	48,14,233.00	2012
CRM-M-53780/21	132/21.08.2019	Kumar Jee Raina	Page No. 42, Serial No. 03	44,85,350.00	2011
CRM-M-53787/21	146/30.08.2019	Pardeep Singh	Page No. 46, Serial No. 35	55,63,090.00	2011
CRM-M-53794/21	134/22.08.2019	Pawan Rawal & Neerja	Page No. 43, Serial No. 02	59,49,131.00	2011
CRM-M-53866/21	121/06.08.2019	Mamta Gupta	Page No. 43, Serial No. 11	36,55,000.00	2007
CRM-M-53664/21	188/02.12.2019	Major Pinto Pandit	Page No. 48, Serial No. 29	55,76,105.00	2011
CRM-M-53685/21	127/17.08.2019	Vinod Sharma	Page No. 42, Serial No. 05	32,63,033.00	2006

Total amount received from 14 complainants / allottees who have approached HRERA (amount deposited) Rs. 7,06,66,420.00

B. The details of the complainants approaching State Commission and the amount deposited by them are mentioned here in below:-

Case No.	FIR No.	Complainant Name	Case Status	Amount Deposited (in Rs)	Year of Agreement
CRM-M-53663/21	0183/24.11.2019	Pardeep Kumar	The appeal is pending before National Commission	57,97,867.00	2011
CRM-M-53655/21	0191/05.12.2019	Ranbir Singh	Execution pending before State Commission	47,72,500.00	2011
CRM-M-53722/21	0131/21.08.2019	Sanjeev Verma	Complaint pending before State Commission	58,51,875.00	2013
CRM-M-53718/21	0205/30.12.2019	Satish K. Garg	Complaint pending before State Commission	33,74,500.00	2006

Total amount received from 04 complainants / allottees who have approached State Commission (amount deposited) Rs. 1,97,96,742.00

C. Thus, the total amount paid by all the 18 complainants / allottees is Rs. 9,04,63,162.00.”

A perusal of the above Chart would show that 14 Complainants have approached the HRERA Authorities and in 12 cases, execution proceedings have been filed, which are pending. It is further apparent that 4 Complainants have filed cases before the Consumer Court and the same are at various stages as indicated in Column No. 4 of Part B of the Chart.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that CRM-M-53678-2021 in which the complainant is Amrish Kumar Bansal may be taken up as a main petition and has further pointed out that the allegations / documents in all the other petitions are also substantially the same.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has no objection in case the said petition is taken up as the main case and has not disputed the fact that the allegations in all the FIRs are substantially the same. Accordingly, the CRM-M-53678-2021 is being taken as the main case and the facts are being stated from the same.

The brief facts of the prosecution case are that FIR under Section 406 and 420 IPC was registered on the complaint of one Amrish Kumar Bansal. The said Amrish Kumar Bansal has stated that he was a resident of Zirakpur and on the basis of an advertisement by the promoters M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd., he and his wife Vandana Bansal had booked one apartment / flat in their ongoing project “Ess Vee Apartments” situated at Sector 20, Panchkula. They had booked a 3 BHK flat at the basic sale price of Rs.67,70,000/- on 25.08.2015. It was stated that the purchase was made with the efforts of **Vinod Bagai**, co-accused. He had deposited an amount of Rs.58,39,069/- including service tax and the flat buyer agreement was executed on 25.08.2015. It is further alleged that **Vinod Bagai**, co-accused assured the complainant that the project would be completed within three years and the complainant would get the possession of the flat within 36 months from the date of commencement of construction. However, the promoters failed to deliver the possession of flat and thereafter, the complainant talked to **Vinod Bagai** several times but the said **Vinod Bagai** always gave lame excuses and new dates for completion of project. It is alleged that for the last 1-2 years, promoters had stopped construction on the pretext of financial crisis and that they had no funds. Several times the complainant requested **Vinod Bagai** to start the construction but he did not bother about the same. Finding no alternative, he had filed complaint before the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula (in short “HRERA”). It is further alleged that from the information uploaded on the website, it had come to the knowledge of the complainant that **Vinod Bagai** and other promoters had cheated him and committed fraud upon them. They had given long term loans and advances because of which they had a financial crunch. The act of the promoters shows that they had no intention

to complete the project. It is further alleged that in the year 2014, **Vinod Bagai** contested the legislative assembly election from District Panchkula and at that time he had filed affidavit with the Returning Officer in which it was admitted that he and his wife had taken a loan of Rs.6.4 crores from M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd. and Rs.8.1 lacs from Ess Vee Contractors. It was further alleged that there were as many as 25 shell companies in which money of innocent buyers had been transferred. The promoters had booked about 50 flats in their names out of which 25 flats had been booked in the name of M/s SRV Investments in which **Vinod Bagai** and the petitioner were directors. It was alleged that promoters had invested Rs.45.8 crores in the 3rd phase of the project whereas, there was no booking of the 3rd phase project. With the said allegations, the FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for petitioner has submitted that in the present case out of 342 allottees, about 50 allottees in connivance with competing builders had started defaulting in the payment of installments, as a result of which construction had to be stopped. It is further submitted that in fact the complainant in as many as 14 cases had gone to HRERA for redressal of grievance whereas the complainant in 4 cases had gone to the consumer forum.

Learned counsel has further argued that the order passed on 30.04.2019 by HRERA forms a part of the order dated 06.01.2021 (Annexure P-8) and even as per the order dated 30.04.2019, it was observed that entire project had 24 towers with 925 apartments out of which 464 apartments had only been allotted and total cost of the project was stated to be Rs.342.56 crores out of which, Rs.208.13 crores had already been invested and only an amount of Rs.94.26 crores had been collected from the

collected from the allottees. The relevant portion of the order dated 30.04.2019 which has been reproduced in the order dated 06.01.2021 (Annexure P-8) is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“(ix) The entire record relating to the project of the respondents has been examined. It is observed that this is a huge project comprised of twenty-four towers with 925 apartments out of which 464 apartments has already been allotted and 461 apartments remains to be allotted to the future allottees. As per the information given in the application for registration, the total cost of the project 342.56 Cr against which 208.13 Cr has already been invested. However, Rs.94.26 Cr has been collected from the allottees. Accordingly, promoters appear to have invested more money than has been collected from the allottees.”

It is further submitted that subsequent to the said order, several persons including 14 complainants mentioned hereinabove have filed execution and the HRERA authorities in exercise of its powers under Section 40 of The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short “2016 Act”) has stated that the amount payable would be recovered as arrears of land revenue and the orders passed in favour of the complainant would be treated as a decree of civil court. The relevant portion of the said order dated 06.01.2021 (Annexue P-8) is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“.....So, the Authority in exercise of powers conferred on it under Section 40 of The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and Rule27 of Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, for recovering the amount payable under order passed by it as arrears of land revenue and for executing such orders as decree of the civil court, decides to recover the amounts payable to the complainants, as reflected in the table reproduced in para 3, of this order as

arrears of land revenue. So, it is ordered that a certificate for the amounts payable to the complainants be issued to the concerned District Collector and the said Collector shall proceed to recover the same in the same manner as arrears of land revenue. Copy of this order be also supplied to each complainant so that they may prosecute the recovery proceedings before Collector. Necessary action be taken accordingly.

6. Cases are disposed of in above terms. Files be consigned to record room.”

It is highlighted that pursuant to the passing of the abovesaid order, the proceedings for recovery of the said amount are pending as is apparent from the letter dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-5) as well as the summons dated 17.03.2021 (Annexure P-6). As per the summons dated 17.03.2021 (Annexure P-5), in fact the petitioner along with **Vinod Bagai**, who was the **Managing Director**, had been asked to come present. It is submitted that since the petitioner is in custody, thus, he was not able to appear and in case, he was released on bail, he would try his best to resolve the matter. It is submitted that the complainants have a remedy of recovering the amount which they had deposited, which they are pursuing, and since the project is on land measuring 14.95 acres in District Panchkula, thus, petitioner is hopeful that the money of the complainants would be recovered in the said proceedings. It is submitted that at any rate, the present dispute has civil trappings and the registration of the present FIR is only to exert pressure on the accused persons to repay the money.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also stated that this is a case in which petitioner and his sister-in-law had invested more money than what was collected from the allottees and thus, the question of their siphoning

petitioner who had given the detailed representation on 30.04.2019, bringing out all the difficulties on account of which the project could not be fully developed and the said representation has been made prior to the registration of present FIR.

Reference has also been made to the certificate dated 20.06.2019 of S.P. Babuta and Associates, Chartered Accountants (Annexure P-9) to submit that total Rs.221.93 crores has been spent by the promoters out of which only Rs.92.75 crores were was received from the allottees. In the said certificate, it is also mentioned that 80% development and construction works had already been completed up to 31.01.2019.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that even a perusal of the resolution dated 01.06.2006, 05.04.2020 and 05.04.2019, it would be apparent that it is Vinod Bagai who is the Managing Director of Samar Estates Pvt. Ltd. and the petitioner is shown as a Director. It is further submitted that the petitioner is 55 years of age and has several health issues including high blood pressure and diabetes. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.02.2021 and the challan in the present case has been filed on 01.04.2021 and there are as many as 23 prosecution witnesses and the trial is likely to take long. It is further submitted that in case the petitioner is granted bail, the petitioner would also help in resolving the issue.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "*Sanjay Chandra vs. CBI*" reported as **2012(1) SCC 40**. It is further submitted that the earlier 17 bail petitions of the petitioner were withdrawn on 17.09.2021 and one bail petition was withdrawn on **27.09.2021** at that stage. It is argued that after the said orders,

been examined and the petitioner has been in continuous custody since 20.02.2021. It is further argued that the 3rd wave of the Covid pandemic is also on the door step, thus, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take time. It is further submitted that the offences are triable by Magistrate and thus, the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

It is pointed out that out of 18 cases, only in 3 cases, i.e. CRM-M-53653-2021, CRM-M-53866-2021 and CRM-M-53664-2021 only one witness, i.e. complainant in respective cases has been examined and none of the other witnesses have been examined. It is submitted that in all other cases, no other witness has been examined and thus, the trial in all the cases is likely to take time. It is further submitted that there are favourable points which have arisen from the cross-examination of the complainant who has been examined in the said 3 cases. Reference regarding the same has been made to Annexure P-12 from CRM-M-53653-2021 in which complainant Jyotsna Leekha (in the said case) has been examined as PW-1 and in her cross-examination, she has specifically admitted at page 78 of the paper book of the said criminal miscellaneous that it is correct that there is no finding about fraud, misappropriation and cheating in the HRERA ORDER Ex.PW1/E. He has further referred to the said evidence wherein the complainant has admitted that it is correct that as per the statement that she has received three initial installments but has not received the last installment. Reference has also been made to the other parts of the cross-examination in support of his case. It is further submitted that the fact that in 15 cases, no witness has been examined even for a period of 3 ½ months from the withdrawal of the earlier petitions and there are certain facts which are in favour of the petitioner from the evidence of the complainant and also

change of circumstances, so as to entitle the petitioner to press the present petition for bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has submitted that in the present case, the total amount which is due towards all the **complainants in all the 18 FIRs** is Rs.9,04,63,162.00. It is further submitted the fact that the petitioner was arrested on 20.02.2021 and the investigation is complete and the challan is presented, has not been disputed but however, neither the possession of the flat nor the money taken from the complainants has been returned to them till date. It is also pointed out that in 2009 all the accused persons have purchased plot no.87 in Sector 7 Panchkula and constructed their own house. As per the report of Chartered Accountant Sh.Satya Goel, advances were given to the Directors amounting to Rs.9,35,12,908/- which was utilized for purchasing the registered office of the company situated at House No.87, Sector 7, Panchkula. Thus, the same showed that money, which was received from the allottees, was also utilized for purchasing the said property. It is further submitted that in the present case, the State is making all endeavours to examine the witnesses and in three cases, the respective complainants have been examined and further necessary steps would be taken to expedite the trial and the circumstances which have been stated by the petitioner cannot be taken to be changed circumstances, so as to entitle him to file the present second regular bail petition. It is further pointed out that before the HRERA authorities, the petitioner and the other co-accused had stated that they would resolve the issue but nothing concrete has been done by them till date and thus, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition.

Learned counsel for petitioner in rebuttal to the above aspect

has submitted that the promoters had utilized their own funds to purchase the

said plot and since the said plot was purchased in year 2009 and since a large number of agreements were entered into after the said year, thus, it cannot be said that the entire amount spent is from the money received from the allottees. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the owner of said premises to the extent of having 1/4th share and he is also ready to give an undertaking that he would not alienate the said house without permission of the Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that when the matter had come up before HRERA on 06.01.2022, around 24 allottees including some of the complainants have moved an application to the effect that they want to take over the possession of one tower, i.e. Tower I so as to enable them to construct that tower at their own end and the representative of the petitioner and other co-accused have appeared before the HRERA authorities and have given them no objection with respect to the said allottees taking over possession of Tower I and raising construction of the same at their own end. It is also stated that every earnest effort is being made and will be made for settling the dispute as even in case the petitioner is granted bail, the petitioner would have to face criminal prosecution, in case, the matter is not settled.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sanjay Chandra's* case (*supra*) has observed as under:-

“We are conscious of the fact that the accused are charged with economic offences of huge magnitude. We are also conscious of the fact that the offences alleged, if proved, may jeopardize the economy of the country. At the same time, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the investigating agency has already completed investigation and the charge sheet is already filed before the Special Judge, CBI, New Delhi.

Therefore, their presence in the custody may not be necessary for further investigation. We are of the view that the appellants are entitled to the grant of bail pending trial on stringent conditions in order to allay the apprehension expressed by CBI.”

It is not in dispute that in the present case, prior to the registration of the FIR, 14 of the complainants had filed applications before the HRERA authorities and 4 complainants had filed cases before the Consumer Forum as is detailed in the Chart hereinabove. On 30.04.2019, the consumer complaints were allowed, vide order dated 30.04.2019, passed in **consumer complaint no. 865 of 2019** which has been reproduced in the order dated 06.01.2021 (Annexure P-8) and the relevant part of the same has already been reproduced hereinabove. Perusal of the same would show that it has been observed by the authority that 464 apartments have already been allotted and out of the total cost of the project which was Rs.342.56 crores, an amount of Rs.208.13 crores had already been invested and only an amount of Rs.94.26 crores has been collected from the allottees which showed that in fact, promoters had invested more money than what they collected from the allottees. It is also clear that after the passing of the said order, the execution of the said order has also been filed and vide order dated 06.01.2021, the relevant portion of which has been reproduced hereinabove, the authority in exercise of its power under Section 40 of 2016 Act have ordered the recovery of amount payable as arrears of land revenue and the Order dated 30.04.2019 has been ordered to be treated as a decree of civil court. In pursuance to the above, the Executive Director, HRERA, Panchkula, vide letter dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-5) addressed to the Collector, Panckhula, issued recovery certificate and directed him to take

further action. Further, in pursuance of the above, Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Panchkula, has issued summons of attendance to petitioner as well as Sunita Bagai and Vinod Bagai. The land in question is stated to be 14.95 acres in Sector 20 Panchkula, Haryana and thus, the petitioner being hopeful that the complainant should be able to recover their money in the said execution proceedings, cannot be stated to be without any basis. Moreover, if petitioner is released then as per the assertion of learned counsel for petitioner, even he could help in finally resolving the matter. The present case whether being a case of a business failure or a case of mis-utilizing the funds collected, would be considered at the time of trial. However, several arguments have been raised which make the whole issue debatable.

It may be relevant to note that in the present case the petitioner has been in custody since 20.02.2021 and in the present case, the challan has already been filed and there are as many as 23 prosecution witnesses and none of them have been examined and thus, the trial is likely to take time. It is further noted that although, the petitioner had withdrawn the earlier bail petitions (17 petitions) on 17.09.2021 at that stage and regular bail petition in the 18th case on 12.10.2021 but in spite of lapse of 3½/2½ months, no substantial progress has taken place in the trial of the present case or even in the other cases. Although in three cases, i.e. CRM-M-53653-2021, CRM-M-53866-2021 and CRM-M-53664-2021, one witness each, has been examined but several witnesses are yet to be examined. In fact in each of the cases, there are more than 22/ 23 witnesses and thus, it is apparent that the trial is likely to take long moreso, in view of the fact that 3rd wave of the pandemic is on the door step. The present case is triable by the Magistrate and the petitioner has been in custody for more than 10 months and 15 days. The

petitioner to file a second set of regular bail applications. Further, a perusal of the evidence of PW-1 Jyotsna Leekha who is the complainant in FIR No.140 dated 27.08.2019 which is subject matter of CRM-M-53653-2021 would also show that there are certain admission made by the said witness which would make the issue as to whether the present case is a case of business failure or fraudulent misappropriation of funds, debatable. The relevant portion of the said evidence which are part of CRM-M-53653-2021 is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“PW1

Jyotsna Lekha W/o Sh. Raj Kumar

R/o #237, Sector-30A, Chandigarh

On SA

Xxx xxx

This is correct that there are no findings about fraud, misappropriation, cheating etc. in the HREERA order Ex.PW1/E. It is also correct that I have not written about the fraud & cheating in the attach settlement along with court order.

xxx xxx xxx

It is correct that as per settlement I have received initial three installments, but have not received last installements.

xxx xxx xxx

I knew that some other people were also filing police complaint before filing complaint Ex.PW1/A. I have not taken help of any person for drafting of complaint. The documents attached with the complaint, the same came from association. I don't have personal knowledge about these documents.

xxx xxx xxx

Ex.PW1/N is only showing that what is the name of company and who are its directors. Ex.PW1/N doesn't

show any transactions made with Samar Estate, I don't know that."

A perusal of the above would show that the complainant in the said case has admitted that there is no finding about the fraud, misappropriation or cheating in the HRERA order and that as per the settlement, three initial installments have been paid but the last installment has not been paid. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner to the effect that in case the intention of the petitioner was fraudulent then installment would not have been paid, cannot be brushed aside. The said witness has been examined on 01.11.2021 after the earlier bail petitions were withdrawn. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner to the effect that on the application of 23 allottees for taking over possession of Tower I for constructing the same on their own, no objection has been given by the representative of the petitioner and the other co-accused and the said aspect would also show that the petitioner wants to resolve the issue, cannot be ignored. Thus, keeping in view the further incarceration period of the petitioner after 17.09.2021, the case being triable by the Magistrate, non examination of the witnesses in 15 cases and examination of one witness in three cases and also considering the cross-examination of the said witnesses, and also the fact that the 3rd wave of the pandemic is on the door step and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future, this Court feels that such subsequent circumstances are sufficient so as to entitle the present petitioner for grant of regular bail in all 18 cases.

Accordingly, all the 18 regular bail petitions are allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to the conditions that the petitioner would execute bond with one solvent surety to the sum of Rs.50,000/- in each case to the satisfaction of the trial Court and

would also be bound by his statement that he would not alienate house no.87, Sector 7, Panchkula without permission of the trial Court and subject to him not being required in any other case other than the 18 cases which are being allowed vide the present order.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as a final 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 applications.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

January 07, 2022
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No