

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

208

2023:PHHC:107055

CRM-M-13857-2023

Date of decision: August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Prashant Kumar Verma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Senior Deputy Advocate General,  
Haryana.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.697 dated 25.11.2022 under Sections 120B, 420, 460, 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt, Ambala.

Vide order dated 27.03.2023, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is the Director of the Cooperative Society which in turn had invested in the Ambey Valley Project of Sahara Group. While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR in question, learned counsel submits that the complainant is essentially aggrieved on account of delay in the disbursal of ₹7,85,014/- which along with accrued interest had been invested by him in the*

*Cooperative Society in which the petitioner was a Director. He submits that the delay in disbursing the maturity amount to the complainant has been on account of the orders of the Apex Court dated 21.11.2013 (Annexure P-6)."*

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 27.03.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He submits that in fact a cancellation report has since been prepared, which would be filed before the trial Court in the near future. It has also further been submitted that in the above circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 27.03.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

**August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023**  
*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No