



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

205

**CRM-M No.32701 of 2024
Date of decision: 27.11.2024**

ANMOL ARORA

.... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. P.K.Ganga, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C seeking grant of pre-arrest bail in case arising out of FIR No.137 dated 05.06.2024 registered under Sections 306 and 34 of IPC and subsequently added Section 406 of IPC at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa.
2. Vide order dated 16.07.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted interim bail and was directed to join investigation. Order dated 16.07.2024, passed by this Court, reads as under :

“The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C seeking grant of pre-arrest bail in case arising out of FIR No.137 dated 05.06.2024 registered under Sections 306 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant-Monika alleging therein that the petitioner Anmol Arora used to have money transactions with her husband Kapil. He had executed an



agreement to sell some land in his favour on 29.07.2022 for a sum of Rs. 40,00,000/-. Her husband had deposited an amount of Rs.20,00,000/- in the bank account of the petitioner and on asking of the petitioner, another amount of Rs.11,00,000/- was given in cash to the petitioner and his father and an amount of Rs.6,00,000/- was deposited in the Bank account of Sanjay. Subsequently, the petitioner had not executed sale deed in pursuance of agreement so executed nor he was returning the money given to him due to which, her husband was under a lot of stress as quarrels had been taking place in the family because of that reason. She alleged that on the same day, her husband had gone to the Village Ludesar to the house of her brother-in-law asking for money as he was under financial crisis where he committed suicide by consuming some poisonous substance. His suicide had been abetted by the petitioner and co-accused Sanjay. After registration of FIR, the investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest the petitioners had moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa vide order dated 01.07.2024.

It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the victim did not come forward in the Office of Sub-Registrar for performing his part of the agreement and to get sale deed executed and even did not approach him for extension of date of agreement due to which



the contract between them had automatically ended. FIR has been registered after a lapse of more than one year and 8 months. Provisions of offences under Section 306 of IPC have not been attracted as against the petitioner at all as neither any instigation nor provocation on his part to commit suicide by the deceased has been alleged or established. He is ready to join investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Notice of motion for 29.08.2024.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks some time to file a status report in the matter.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer to join investigation within one week or as and when subsequently required thereafter. In the event of his arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on interim bail on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

3. Further vide order dated 29.08.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner was again directed to join the investigation.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation on 08.09.2024 and he is not required for custodial interrogation.



5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has resisted the allowing the petition.
6. Keeping in view the above mentioned facts and circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 16.07.2024, granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute, subject to compliance of usual terms and conditions requisite for grant of anticipatory bail.

27.11.2024
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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