

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

224

CRM-M-36091-2023

Date of decision: 09.08.2023

Aryan Raj @ Vikram and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Abhay, Advocate for  
Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mayank Mahla, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

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

1. The petitioners are seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.7 dated 19.10.2022 under Sections 386, 406, 419, 420, 467, 469, 471, 120-B and 201 of the IPC registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Sonipat, District Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it was on account of some misunderstanding, the FIR in question came to be registered against the petitioners, however, subsequently, the said misunderstanding was removed and an amicable settlement arrived at between the parties. It has further been submitted that the petitioners have now been in custody since 08.11.2022, 06.02.2023 and 13.11.2022 respectively and after the challan was presented, charges stand framed. Learned counsel has also submitted that similarly placed co-accused Mahfooj Alam and Prince Raj @ Santu Kumar have since

been extended the concession of bail by this Court vide orders dated 17.07.2023 and 20.07.2023. A prayer has, therefore, been made that in the circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioners would serve no useful purpose, more so, when the petitioners have clean antecedents.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, by contending on instructions, that enough material was collected during investigation that the petitioners along with co-accused had taken money from the complainant on the pretext of getting a license for IFFCO Fertilizers' dealership. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel qua the criminal antecedents of the petitioners, he on instructions, has not disputed that the petitioners are not involved in any other criminal case.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that the parties have ironed out their differences and arrived at an amicable settlement. He also does not oppose the prayer made by the counsel opposite for extending the concession of bail to the petitioners.

5. Learned counsel for the parties have also apprised the Court that in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, they would be approaching this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR in question.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

7. The petitioners have been in custody since 08.11.2022, 06.02.2023 and 13.11.2023 respectively and the parties have amicably

resolved their disputes and are ready to approach this Court for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of compromise. In the facts and circumstances, as enumerated hereinabove, this Court thus deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioners, more so when co-accused Mahfooj Alam and Prince Raj @ Santu Kumar have already been extended the concession of bail by this Court.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioners be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.08.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |