

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

CRM-M-40825-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.09.2023

Ravi

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.376 dated 18.08.2022, under Sections 409, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case the petitioner has already paid an amount of Rs.3,85,000/- to the complainant and the disputed amount in the present case is only Rs. 5,50,000/-. He submitted that vide order dated 11.11.2022, the petitioner was granted interim protection by this Court and direction was issued to join the investigation. He submitted that the petitioner could not join the investigation in view of the fact that he suffered a brain stroke and he was not even in a position to join the investigation. He further submitted that apart from the above

even now almost the entire amount has been paid to the complainant. He also submitted that on 14.07.2023, this Court had asked the State to ascertain the aforesaid factual position with regard to the medical condition of the petitioner.

3. Today, Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, DAG, Haryana has stated on instructions from SI Rampal that it has been verified that the petitioner has suffered brain stroke and he is not able to come and join the investigation process due to his medical ailment. He submitted that even otherwise also almost the entire amount has been paid to the complainant and the dispute was a money dispute. He submitted that in view of the medical condition of the petitioner, till the time he recovers, he is not required for custodial interrogation and the State has no objection in case the anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 11.11.2022 is hereby made absolute.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

01.09.2023
rakesh

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