



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

CRM-M No.838 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 15th May, 2024

Somvir

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Neelam Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Hemant Bassi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM No.21184 of 2024

In view of the averments made in the application and in the interest of justice, the same is allowed as prayed for and the additional affidavit of the petitioner is taken on record.

CRM-M No.838 of 2024

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.187 dated 27.09.2023 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Behal, District Bhiwani.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 15.02.2024, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to



join investigation on account of the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on 09.01.2024:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the alleged subsidy amount and it was a matter of record that the said amount had been deposited into the accounts of co-accused Ashok and Raj Kumar; during an inquiry by the CM Flying Squad as well as in the first disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Ashok, there was no mention whatsoever about the involvement of the petitioner in the crime in question and it was much later on a second disclosure statement made by co-accused Ashok, the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the case in hand on the allegations that he obtained ₹ 1 lakh fraudulently from Ashok.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 15.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. 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.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 15.02.2024 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

May 15, 2024
rps

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