

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(205) CRM-M-4272-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-29.04.2024

AshutoshPetitioner
Versus
State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Manjit Saini, Advocate for
Ms. Minkal Thatai, Advocate for the complainant.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.918 dated 14.11.2023, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, registered at Police Station Yamuna Nagar City, District Yamuna Nagar.
2. Learned counsel for the complainant has pointed out that the petitioner has played a fraud with her and she being an illiterate lady her signatures have been forged not only in opening the Bank accounts but for sale of some ancestral land also but could not deny the fact that all the evidences are documentary in nature.
3. Vide order dated **14.02.2024**, this Court while granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail directed the petitioner to join investigation.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Jagdish Chander submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation but has

vehemently opposed the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner be made absolute as there is a chance that the petitioner might tamper with the evidence being in close proximity with the family of the complainant.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the entire evidence is documentary in nature, more so, the petitioner has demonstrated his *bona fide* by remitting a sum of Rs.4,50,000/- to the complainant, hence, the petition is allowed. The order dated **14.02.2024** granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the Investigating Agency and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

6. However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. It is made clear that, in case, the petitioner is found involved in any such activity once again, the State is at liberty to promptly move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail detailing out the circumstances and violation of the condition(s) of bail.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

29.04.2024

manju

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

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