



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

CRM-M No.56582 of 2022
Date of decision: 27th May, 2024

Kamleshwar Rajendranath Pandey

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Navdeep Kalair, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Ankush Singla, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.116 dated 19.09.2022 for the offences under Sections 420, 406, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station City Dhuri, District Sangrur.

2. Vide order dated 14.02.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, a coordinate Bench of this Court had granted interim bail for three months to the petitioner and directed the parties to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court:

“The dispute in the present case is with regard to certain cars which were to be delivered by the petitioner to the complainant. There was a deal of 62 cars which were to



be delivered by the petitioner to the complainant and out of those 62 cars, only 39 cars were supplied and remaining 23 cars were not supplied. As per the complainant, even the documents pertaining to 20 cars were not given by the petitioner to the complainant and a total sum of Rs.82 lacs have been transferred by the complainant to the petitioner's account on various dates and as on date approximately Rs.18.5 lacs is due to be paid by the petitioner to the complainant (for 23 remaining cars which were not delivered).”

3. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 06.03.2024, in the light of report received from the Mediation and Conciliation Centre where the parties failed to arrived at any settlement, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 06.03.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Pinjore Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.



6. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 06.03.2024 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

May 27, 2024
rps

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