



201

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33525-2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.05.2024

Dharam Singh Yadav

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Narender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.306 dated 11.07.2013 under Sections 420 & 193 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Sonapat, District Sonapat.

2. On 10.10.2013, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in an identical matter on the same set of allegations, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing CrI.Misc. No.M-26292 of 2013 wherein notice of motion has been issued and



interim protection was also granted.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Pradeep Virk, DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State of Haryana.

Copy of the petition be supplied to learned State counsel during the course of day.

Interim order in the same terms as granted in Crl.Misc. No.M-26292 of 2013.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation at Sonapat on 17.10.2013.

The persons, namely, H.S. Yadav, L.R. Yadav and Narender Singh, who have filed their affidavits are also directed to appear before the Investigating Officer at Gurgaon in support of the averments made in the affidavits as the same is necessary for the decision of this case.

Complainant S.K. Sharma is also present in the Court and requests for impleadment as respondent being the complainant. He is at liberty to move an application for impleading him as complainant-respondent.


Meanwhile, Haryana Urban Development Authority is also directed to file status report as to what action has been taken and is likely to be taken in future.

Adjourned to 22.10.2013. To be taken up at 02.00 p.m.

A copy of the order be given dasti to learned counsel for he parties under the signatures of Bench Secretary.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Kuldeep, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated



10.10.2013 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. The petition stands disposed of.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

17.05.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No