



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-9696-2025

Date of decision: May 26th, 2025

Deputi Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate
for Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Chander Shekhar
and Mr. Manmohan Saroop, Advocates
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.226 dated 21.09.2024 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.

2. Vide order dated 28.02.2025 passed by a coordinate Bench, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, inter alia, submits that the present petitioner is falsely implicated in the present case and has nothing to do with the alleged sale deed dated 25.4.2024 executed by co-accused Surinder

Kumar in favour of co-accused Ishwar and has got no connection with another transfer/sale deed stated to be executed by Joginder Singh in favour of Surinder Kumar on 3.1.2024.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is not signatory to both the aforesaid transfer/sale deeds and is not beneficiary in any manner with regard to the aforesaid two sale transactions. He further submits that the sale deed dated 1.5.2024 which finds mention in the FIR, is executed by the present petitioner to the extent of his own share out of the joint land and the petitioner was legally entitled to do so being co-sharer. It is further submitted that the petitioner, who is having no criminal history, is ready and willing to join investigation with the police”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 28.02.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, 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.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 28.02.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

May 26th, 2025

Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

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