



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

293

CRM-M-32282-2024

Date of Decision : September 12, 2024

ANIL BANSAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate with
Mr. Paritosh Vaid, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Raghav Garg, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. On 8.8.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, in case FIR No.158 dated 11.05.2024, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sohana, District S.A.S. Nagar.

2. On 31.07.2024, consequent upon the parties being ad idem that the matter can be settled amicably, this Court had referred the present matter to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, for exploring the probabilities of amicable settlement.

3. The Mediator concerned sent a report that, there are chances of amicable settlement between the parties, however, some more time would be required.



CRM-M-32282-2024

-2-

4. Today, the learned counsel for the petitioner has produced the photocopy of a settlement deed dated 07.08.2024, which has been executed inter se the parties, to submit that since the matter has been settled, therefore, the petitioner may be granted the concession of anticipatory bail. The photocopy of settlement deed is taken on record.

5. The learned counsels appearing for the complainant, and, for the proposed respondent No.2, namely, Charan Singh, Director, M/s Preet Land Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd., have admitted the factum of settlement inter se the parties and have also expressed their respective 'No Objection', in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Without going into merits of the case, but, solely taking into account the settlement arrived at inter se the parties, coupled with 'No Objection' of the opposite counsels, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the asked for relief to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and to appear before the investigating agency, as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

8. List on 12.09.2024.

9. On the subsequent date of hearing, the learned State counsel is directed to file a supplementary reply, after the petitioner joins the investigation."

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned, stated that pursuant to the making of the



CRM-M-32282-2024

-3-

hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for further custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 8.8.2024, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

“(i) the petitioner(s) shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall make himself/herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

5. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

September 12, 2024
ajay-1

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No