

132+143

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 16.12.2024

CRM-M-58500-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61020-2024 (O&M)

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-60949-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-60954-2024

RAHUL SOOD

... PETITIONER

CRM-M-60995-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61027-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61032-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61064-2024

RAHUL SOOD

VS.

... PETITIONER

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61079-2024

RAHUL SOOD

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

VS.

... PETITIONER

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61081-2024

RAHUL SOOD

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

VS.

... PETITIONER

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61103-2024

RAHUL SOOD

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

VS.

... PETITIONER

.. RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-61834-2024

RAHUL SOOD

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

VS.

... PETITIONER

.. RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate and
Ms. Bindu Tanwar
Mr. Shashank Shekhar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant in CRM-M-58500-2024.

ANOOP CHITKARA , J.(ORAL)

1. In all these petitions common question of law and facts are involved, however, FIRs are different, all these petitions are taken together. For brevity, the facts are taken from CRM-M-58500-2024
2. Seeking quashing of FIR No. 23 dated 21.01.2017 registered under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 IPC at Police Staiton Ladwa, District Kurukshetra, Haryana, the petitioner has come up before this Court under Section 528 BNSS, 2023.

3. Counsel for the complainant has put in appearance in CRM-M-58500-2024 and filed his power of attorney.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no allegation of criminal breach of trust, cheating, injury or threat against the petitioner, he has been unnecessarily named as an accused in the FIR due to which he is facing severe mental agony, stress and trauma and incident relates back to the year 2014.
5. Counsel for the complainant submits that in one of the FIR, the petitioner's anticipatory bail application has already been rejected which shows that *prima facie*, he is involved and prosecution have ample evidence against him.
6. To this, the petitioner's counsel submits that he has all the rights to seek anticipatory bail from higher Court, in case need arises, but the conduct of the State for not arresting him despite his bail being rejected shows that there is nothing against him and the intention of the Investigator is not to arrest him.
7. On the other hand, State counsel opposed the petition on the ground that investigation is in progress and it is a huge scam and at this stage any interference may hamper investigation. He further submits that, till date prosecution is not launched and petition is pre-mature and investigation was delayed due to a writ petition filed before this Court which was disposed of on 05.11.2024.
8. I have gone through the record and rival contention of the parties. This Court is of the opinion that end of justice would meet if following relief is granted to the petitioner, even State and complainant would also be benefitted from the same:-

i). if investigator wants to arrest the petitioner, in that case, he shall apprise the petitioner atleast four days in advance (four working days) enabling him to take legal remedy,
ii) Investigator shall take up the investigation on speedy mode and shall try to complete the same before 30.06.2025
iii) In case, prosecution is launched against the petitioner, in that case, petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the said charge-sheet and disposal of this petition shall not come in his way.
iv) Petitioner may file an application for discharge before the trial Court if prosecution is launched, if such application is filed, in that case, trial Court shall decide the same before passing any order qua framing of charges by passing a reasoned order and petitioner is also at liberty to raise all points including those which are raised in this petition.
9. With the aforesaid observations, all the petitions stand disposed of. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

16.12.2024

smriti

(ANOOP CHITKARA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

: Yes/No

: Yes/No