

202

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

CRM-M-53056-2021

Date of decision : 01.02.2022

Roshan Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ajay Ghangas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.134 dated 08.03.2021 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

On 20.12.2021, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is a 58 year old person, who had initially got registered an FIR bearing no.68 dated 04.02.2020 and perusal of the said FIR would show that

that it is nowhere mentioned in the said FIR that the affidavit in question was sought to be relied upon by the petitioner. It is further argued that even as per the impugned order, it is not the petitioner who had given the affidavit to the police but it had been given by co-accused Bunesh Kumar.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court Mr.Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the State of Haryana.

Adjourned to 01.02.2022.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to 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 as and when called upon to do so 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 20.12.2021, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Krishan Kumar, 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 20.12.2021 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 20.12.2021 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.

01.02.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No