

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

**CRM-M-16041-2024
DECIDED ON: 14.05.2024**

RAKESH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai and Mr. Saurav Dogra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. A.D.S Sukhija, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Wazir Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.295, dated 15.07.2023 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 120-B, 406, 419, 420, 506 IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

This Court vide order dated 03.04.2024, while issuing notice of motion, granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner, subject to his joining the investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the order dated 03.04.2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel does not controvert the said fact and further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Learned Senior counsel for the complainant Mr. ADS Sukhija, Advocate has filed written statement/reply, which is taken on record. Copy

thereof has been supplied to the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner today in Court. He vehemently opposes the grant of anticipatory bail despite the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation as has been stated hereinabove by learned State counsel. He supports his contention on the strength that the petitioner has issued two undertakings qua the return of amount and in case if he was not associated with or has no connection to the commissioning of offence under Sections 419, 420 and 406 IPC then where was the occasion for the petitioner to give such undertakings and the petitioner is involved in two other cases of similar nature, who has duped various other persons bank account and it was purposely the money was credited to the account of Satpal and that of account furnished at the behest of other duped persons.

In view of the above, the order dated 03.04.2024 is made absolute.

Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

14.05.2024
Poonam Negi

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