

223 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20270-2024

Date of Decision: 30.04.2024

Aman Bali @ Goldy

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kushagra Beniwal, Advocate, for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.432 dated 27.12.2023 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 419, 467, 468, 471 of IPC added later on), at Police Station, Bahalgarh, District Sonapat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been wrongly involved by the police in the present case. He further contends that after registration of the FIR, the dispute has been amicably resolved between the parties and an amount of Rs. 2,86,000/- has been paid to the complainant vide demand draft bearing No.100099 dated 19.03.2024 and an amount of Rs.9,000/- has been released in favour of the complainant from the trial Court. Thus, the entire payment has already been made in favour of the complainant. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 04.01.2024 and

the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented before the Court of law.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in four other criminal cases and does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and he has no objection, in case the petition is allowed by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than three months and after completion of the investigation, challan has already been presented before the Court of law. Moreover, the financial dispute between the parties has already been settled and an amount of Rs. 2,95,000/- has already been paid by the petitioner to the complainant in the present case. Thus, no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

30.04.2024.
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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