



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

CRM-M No.30209 of 2024
Date of decision: 13th August, 2024

Mahipal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Gursimran Walia, Advocate for
Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gagandeep S. Chhina, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.334 dated 11.11.2022 for the offences under Sections 418, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the IPC registered at Police Station Mundkati, District Palwal.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 20.06.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Inter alia contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and subsequently during the course of investigation, it was alleged that the petitioner was a witness in one of the General Power of Attorney which was cancelled and which was not used for the purpose of executing the sale deed. It is further submitted that the complainant had appeared in the witness box as PW1 and she has turned hostile and has not supported the case of the



prosecution. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in the case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Sunita @ Shishan, Savitri and Chanderwati and that Akash @ Aakash, who is similarly placed as the present petitioner, had filed CRM-M-21025-2024 for anticipatory bail in which the Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to grant interim protection to the said Akash @ Aakash.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 20.06.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 20.06.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 13, 2024
rps

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