

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

207

2024:PHHC:007058

CRM-M-53509-2023

Date of decision: January 19th, 2024

Punit @ Puneet Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasleen Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.549 dated 08.08.2023 under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Sections 10 and 24 of Immigration Act registered at Police Station Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. Vide order dated 20.10.2023, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that he has been falsely implicated in the case in hand along with other co-accused for allegedly duping the complainant to the tune of lakhs on the pretext of sending him abroad. He submits that a bare perusal of the FIR reveals that no offence much less cheating is made out. While drawing the attention of this Court to Annexure P-3, learned counsel submits that it was a matter of record that the complainant had already been provided his visa for New Zealand. He submits

that the petitioner had provided professional services to the complainant time and again, and the instant case was lodged by the complainant as a pressure tactic to evade from his liability to pay professional fee to the petitioner, which has not been paid to him till date. He submits that the Court below had earlier directed him to join investigation, however, he could not join in time, and subsequently vide impugned order dated 05.10.2023, his petition came to be dismissed.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 20.10.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.
4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. She on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.
5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 20.10.2023 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

January 19th, 2024
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No