



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

CRM-M No.30581 of 2024
Date of decision: 27th August, 2024

Naresh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Shiv K. Rana & Ms. Priya Parmar Rana,
Advocates for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Mahesh Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.207 dated 06.06.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 506, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Jind, District Jind.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 26.06.2024, 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.

“The present case was registered on the statement of complainant-Satvinder made before the police on 03.06.2024, wherein he submitted that on 18.02.2023, he agreed to sell his Truck no. HR-69C-



5841 Model 2018 Chassis no. MAT704122R3E06143, Engine no. PEM923040E63670120 to Sunder s/o Mangal resident of village Badanpur Tehsil Narwana District Jind for a sum of Rs.24 Lacs in village Manoharpur. There was loan of Rs.21 Lacs on this vehicle and this loan amount was to be paid by the purchaser, the purchaser was to pay Rs.1,00,000/- on 20.02.2023 and he was to pay Rs.2,00,000/- on 20.03.2023 and out of this amount he has paid Rs.1,00,000/- but he has not paid Rs.2,00,000/- till date. He assured to pay 36 loan instalments @ Rs.73500/- of which he has paid only 10 instalments and they asked Sunder son of Mangal to pay remaining amount then he refused to pay the same and said that his vehicle was sold to Kabadi. The condition of his vehicle was made worst by him. On 14.05.2024 they took a Panchayat to him. They refused to pay his above amount in the Panchayat. On 19.05.2024, they made complaint in P.S. Sadar Jind in this regard. ASI Mahender Singh P.S. Sadar Jind recovered the Truck in damaged condition. Mahender Singh made several calls to all the three accused but did not come. They once came and sought two days time and thereafter they did not come till today. They threatened him to crush him under the truck. He has paid the loan instalments of his truck. He suffering from mental puzzleness. Due to his illness he sold this truck. The above three persons are responsible for any mishap with him. Hence, the present FIR.



Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that no role has been attributed to the petitioner in the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and he is ready and willing to join the investigation.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 26.06.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. A prayer has, therefore, been made to make the order dated 26.06.2024 absolute.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions, has however, opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that although the petitioner has joined investigation, however, recovery of the original documents of the truck, which had allegedly been purchased by the petitioner along with the co-accused, had not yet been handed over to the Investigating Agency. It has, however, not been disputed by the learned State counsel that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. She, on further instructions, has submitted that except for the recovery of documents, the petitioner is not required for his custodial interrogation.

5. Be that as it may, since the petitioner, in compliance of the directions of this Court, has joined investigation, this Court deems it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to him in the



present case. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 26.06.2024 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 27, 2024
rps

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