

[209] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-59539-2023
Date of Decision : 24.01.2024

Vishal Kumar ...Petitioner
versus
State of PunjabRespondent

Coram : HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present : Ms. Isha Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Parneet Singh Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

[1] On 28.11.2023, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ Present: Ms. Isha Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., prayer is made for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0019 dated 25.01.2020, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Dhakoli, District SAS Nagar.

Allegations are that loan of ₹15 lacs was availed by a firm M/s M.G. Constructions through its proprietor Jai Parkash from State Bank of India for his business purposes. Petitioner Vishal Kumar stood as a guarantor and mortgaged his property in favour of the bank. It is alleged that the loanee sold the hypothecated stock and equipments used in his business and thus misappropriated the funds of the bank.

Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the mortgaged property of the petitioner as guarantor is still with the bank, which has not been sold and that allegation is against the borrower to have sold the hypothecated stock.

Notice of motion.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A copy of paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.

Adjourned to 24.01.2024 for filing status report.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to join investigation and co-operate in the same. He will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court nor shall make any attempt to contact the complainant of the case or any witness associated with the case. In the event of the arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

[2] Today, learned State Counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 28.11.2023 and is no longer required for further investigation.

[3] In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 28.11.2023, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

[4] Disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

24.01.2024
'Rajneesh'

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