

CRM-M-6109-2024
Date of decision: 11.03.2024

...PETITIONER

...RESPONDENT

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

2. On 05.02.2024, following order was passed:

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and he has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused namely Aslam, who has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 15.12.2023 passed in CRM-M No.18219 of 2023 titled as Aslam Vs. State of Haryana. Even recovery of Rs.1,92,000/- out of Rs.1,94,000/- has already been made from the co-accused. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

*In the meantime, keeping in view the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022)***

10 SCC 51; Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Mohd. Muslim alias Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352, at the first instance, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on or before 12.02.2024 and on his doing so or in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

If the Investigating/Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Adjourned to 11.03.2024.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Govind, submits that in compliance of order dated 05.02.2024, passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further custodial interrogation.
4. Keeping in view the statement made by learned State Counsel the order dated 05.02.2024, is made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
5. The petition is accordingly allowed.
6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

March 11, 2024

manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)

JUDGE

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