

204/2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46772-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.01.2023

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Balraj Singh Rathee, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in the case bearing  
FIR No.24 dated 01.02.2022 under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/506/120-  
B read with Section 34 IPC registered at Police Station Mohana, District  
Sonipat.

On 12.10.2022, the following order was passed:-

“*Inter alia* contends that the petitioner has not been  
named in the FIR and there is no allegation against the  
petitioner that he had ever met the complainant or had  
ever induced him or had taken any money from him. It is  
submitted that the petitioner is sought to be implicated  
solely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused  
and the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal  
case. It is further submitted that without admitting his  
liability and in order to show his bonafide, the petitioner  
is ready to pay Rs.50,000/- to the complainant Kuldeep.  
It is stated that anticipatory bail application of the co-  
accused is listed for 17.10.2022 in which notice of  
motion was issued and interim protection was granted.

Notice of motion for 17.10.2022.

To be heard along with CRM-M-41560-2022.

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.

The petitioner is directed to bring a demand draft of Rs.50,000/- in the name of the complainant in the Court on the next date of hearing.

It is made clear that in case the demand draft of the said amount is not brought on the next date of hearing, then the interim order granted is liable to be vacated.

The payment of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant would not be construed as an admission of guilt by the petitioner.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance of interim directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and demand draft of Rs.50,000/- has already been handed over to the complainant.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has also not disputed that fact of receipt of demand draft of Rs.50,000/-.

Keeping in view the entire circumstances, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, order dated 12.10.2022, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is made absolute.

Petition is allowed.

18.01.2023  
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No