

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51884-2023
Date of decision: 16.02.2024

Surender Singh Verma
Vs.
State of Haryana and another

...Petitioner
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Jitender Nara, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Himmat Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2-HSVP.

Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate,
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J. (oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.404 dated 17.07.2023, under Section 420 IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Hisar, District Hisar.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 28.11.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“By referring to the allegations levelled in the FIR, counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that he was working as Tehsildar when sale deed dated 04.09.2013 was presented for registration. He submits

that one Kuldeep, duly identified Vinod, who was the owner of the land as per the jamabandi for the year 2008-09 and the sale deed was drafted by two lawyers. He submits that the petitioner registered the sale deed in due discharge of his duties and he is not a beneficiary of the alleged forgery. He submits that the petitioner is prepared to join the investigation.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 28.11.2023 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. Hence, the aforesaid order be made absolute.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the submissions made by the counsel opposite with respect to the petitioner having joined investigation and having co-operated with the investigating agency. He has, on further instructions, informed the Court that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 28.11.2023 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438 (2) Cr. P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

16.02.2024
Ajay Prasher

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