

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.46553 of 2019
Date of decision: 12th December, 2023

Vaneet Mahajan

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

Respondent No.2 – in person.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.61 dated 13.09.2019 under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 470, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Mansa Devi Complex, District Panchkula.

2. On 01.11.2019, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter has been amicably compromised between the petitioner and other co-accused with the complainant, as per the settlement deed (copy

Annexure P-2), with even CRM-M No.46081 of 2019 having been filed seeking quashing of the FIR on the basis of said compromise deed.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the undertaking given before this Court on the previous date of hearing, the petitioner had made payment of the balance amount to the complainant.

4. Respondent No.2, who is appearing in person, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite. He further submits that he would not oppose the prayer made by the petitioner for extending him the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. She, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 01.11.2019 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 bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

December 12, 2023

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No