



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

1. CRM-M No.38065 of 2024 (O&M)

Patoliya Kush Kanaiyalal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

2. CRM-M No.38069 of 2024 (O&M)

Kahar Ramnarayan Harirambhai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

3. CRM-M No.38071 of 2024 (O&M)

Tukaram Pawar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

Date of decision: 28th November, 2024

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ajit K. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners in all the three petitions detailed hereinabove are seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.30 dated 09.02.2024 under Sections 120-B/420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 3(2) of The Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013, registered at Police

Station Panipat City. Since all these petitions have arisen out of the same FIR, they are being taken up together for disposal by way of this common order.

2. On 25.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned State counsel, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioners and asked them to join investigation.

“On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel as to whether the role assigned to the petitioners in the FIR in question was identical to that of co-accused Madan Singh Rajpurohit, since the latter too had joined as Director of Hindustan Energy Savers Private Limited on 28.11.2023, she, on instructions, has replied in the affirmative. However, it has been submitted by the learned State counsel that on the day when the seminar was allegedly organized by Hindustan Energy Savers Private Limited at Panipat on 26.04.2023, the petitioners were present along with the other co-accused.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of the order dated 25.09.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Joginder Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioners are not required for further investigation much less for their custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, all these petitions are allowed and the interim order dated 25.09.2024 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 petitioners misuse the concession of bail granted to them, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to them.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

November 28, 2024
rps

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