

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

103 CRM-M-39431-2023  
Date of Decision : February 12, 2024

RANJIT KUMAR BHUPATIBHAI SHYORA -PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA -RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate and  
Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Umesh Goyal (Complainant in person).

\*\*\*

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. On 11.08.2023, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had passed  
the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

*“Notice of motion.*

*On advance service of copy of petition, learned State counsel  
appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State of  
Haryana. Learned State counsel to file a report qua the role  
attributed to petitioner as well as specific recitals of the pending  
cases between the parties both civil and criminal.*

*To be heard along with CRM-M-33551-2023 on 19.09.2023.*

*Meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation as and when  
required by the investigating agency and subject to his reporting to  
investigating officer within two weeks from today, no coercive steps  
qua arrest of the petitioner shall be taken. In case, his arrest is  
required to be caused, petitioner shall be released on bail by  
Arresting Officer till the next date of hearing, on furnishing  
adequate personal bonds to his satisfaction. Petitioner shall also  
abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) of  
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”*

2. Today, the learned State counsel, on instructions imparted to  
him by A.S.I. Naveen Kumar, has stated that pursuant to the making of

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

3. At this stage, the complainant, who is present in person, submits that since the recovery of money, which falls within the ambit of “proceeds of crime”, is yet to be effected, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Though the complainant has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, however, since this Court is, at this stage, not adjudicating the issue: “*whether the petitioner has in fact committed the alleged crime or not*”, rather is only examining the issue relating to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, therefore, in view of what has been stated by the learned State counsel, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 11.08.2023, as made by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner 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.

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

**February 12, 2024**  
**devinder**

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |