

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 11.03.2024

(1) CRM-M-784-2024

Surjeet SinghPetitioner.

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent.

(2) CRM-M-3018-2024

Manjeet SinghPetitioner.

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Abnash Singh Bakshi, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-784-2024.

Mr. Manjit Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. B.S. Sra, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-3018-2024.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate and
Mr. Ish Karan Singh Chhabra, Advocate,
for the complainant.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. Both the aforesaid petitions, i.e. CRM-M-784-2024 and
CRM-M-3018-2024 are filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C, vide which the

petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1). Details of the FIR are as under: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
207	08.07.2023	420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B IPC	Rai, District Sonapat, Haryana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance to the order dated 16.02.2024, the petitioners have joined the investigation.
3. During the course of hearing on 16.02.2024, following order has been passed: -

‘2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that both petitioners happen to be the son of the complainant and at the relevant time when the land was acquired by the authorities, the revenue record reflecting the petitioners as owners thereof and accordingly, the compensation was paid to the petitioners. They further contend that, later on, the petitioners paid the share of compensation to the complainant pertaining to the land as well as building.

3. Learned counsel for both the petitioners further contend that civil litigation qua the property is already pending in the Civil Court between the parties and the petitioners are not having any criminal antecedents and the petitioners are ready to join investigation.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the bail applications and prayed for dismissal thereof, on the ground that both the petitioners have defrauded their father, namely Dalip Singh, who is the complainant in both cases and have got the property

transferred in the name of their wards, however, pendency of the civil litigation was not disputed.

5. In these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, it is deemed appropriate that the petitioners should join investigation before deciding the petition on merits, accordingly, the petitioners in both the petitions, i.e. **CRM-M-784-2024** and **CRM-M-3018-2024**, are hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the event of their arrest, they are ordered to be released on interim bail on their furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. They shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

6. Adjourned to 04.03.2024.

7. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected file.'

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Ajmer, informs the Court that the petitioners have joined the investigation and are neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.

5. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioners had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 16.02.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 16.02.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Further the petitioners are directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioners; they

CRM-M-784-2024
CRM-3018-2024

will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and
will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

6. Accordingly, both petitions, i.e. CRM-M-784-2024 and
CRM-M-3018-2024, stand allowed.

7. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall
not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the
case.

11.03.2024
kanika

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |