



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-34925-2024

Date of Decision : **August 13, 2024**

RAVI GODARA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. K.L.Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. On 24.7.2024, 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.12 dated 28.11.2022, under Sections 170/419 of the IPC, and, Section 66-D of the I.T. Act, registered at Cyber Police Station, Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. Succinctly stated, the genesis of the present FIR is embodied in a written complaint made by one Rajiv Kumar, A.S.I., wherein, he alleged that a person used fake D.P. on whatsapp and impersonated the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Mahendergarh.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither there is any direct allegation that the petitioner is the person, who impersonated the Assistant



CRM-M-34925-2024

-2-

Superintendent of Police concerned, nor the investigating agency is seized of any cogent inculpatory evidence to prove the allegations against the petitioner. In fact, the petitioner does not have any concern or connection with the alleged mobile number, whereon the fake D.P. was used for impersonation.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner also draws attention of this Court towards the order dated 01.09.2023, drawn upon CRM-M-118-2023, whereby, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court has granted anticipatory bail to petitioner's co-accused Parmeet.

5. Furthermore, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, vide order dated 08.07.2024, even the Additional Sessions Judge, Narnaul, had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, however, owing to the bona fide reasons mentioned in the instant petition, when the petitioner could not join investigation, his anticipatory bail application was dismissed vide order dated 09.07.2024.

6. Finally, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to cooperate with the investigating agency.

7. Notice of motion for 13.08.2024.

8. Mr. Bhupender Singh, D.A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana.

9. In the meantime, 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



CRM-M-34925-2024

-3-

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.

10. It is clarified that, in case the petitioner fails to join the investigation, no further opportunity will be granted in this regard.”

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned, stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 24.7.2024, 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.

August 13, 2024
ajay-1

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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