

2025:PHHC:062392



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

101+284

CRM-M-21193-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.05.2025

Sham Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Manvinder Singh Dalal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate and
Ms. Priya Malik, Advocate
for the complainant.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.(ORAL)

CRM-19025-2025

Prayer in this application is for placing on record
settlement/compromise dated 03.05.2025 arrived at between the parties.

2 Allowed as prayed for. Settlement/compromise dated
03.05.2025 is taken on record as Annexure A-1, subject to all just
exceptions.

CRM-M-21193-2025

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS,
2023 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.36 dated
25.03.2025, under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station

Sector 9, Ambala City, District Ambala.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case on the allegations that he along with his son Pratham Saini @ Monty had cheated the complainant by dishonestly inducing to part with an amount of Rs.17,60,000/- on the pretext of sending him to UK. Petitioner being father of main accused was involved in the present FIR though no specific role had been attributed to him. He has submitted that now matter has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a mutual settlement/compromise (Annexure A1) and therefore, petitioner be released on anticipatory bail.

3 Learned State counsel has also filed a supplementary status report dated 11.05.2025, which is taken on record. In para No.7 of the said report, it has been mentioned that on examination of statement of complainant, statement of his father, affidavit and mutual compromise, it seems that parties have settled their dispute amicably and have requested not to proceed further in the present matter.

4 Learned counsel for the complainant has also admitted the factum of compromise between the parties and he has no objection if the present application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is allowed.

5 Keeping in view the fact that a compromise has already been effected between the parties, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the present case for any purpose. The present petition is *allowed*. In the event of arrest, petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice

in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

6 Petition stands allowed.

12.05.2025	(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
jyoti3	JUDGE
<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>