

Punit Kumar Vs. Punit Kumar

Punit Kumar Vs. Punit Kumar

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1121365

Court : Punjab and Haryana

Decided On : Jan-28-2014

Appellant : Punit Kumar

Respondent : Punit Kumar

Judgement :

Crl.M.No.M-43441 of 2013 (O&M) -1- IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl.M.No.M-43441 of 2013 (O&M) Date of Decision: January 28, 2014 Punit KumarPetitioner v.

State of HaryanaRespondent CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAM CHAND GUPTA Present: Mr.A.S.Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Raja Sharma, AAG, Haryana....RAM CHAND GUPTA, J.(Oral) The present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.230, dated 7.10.2013, under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the whole record carefully.

This Court while issuing notice of motion on 19.12.2013, passed the following order: Inter alia contends that petitioner is having no role with working of Grow

Mark Fruit and Vegetables Production and Marketing Society Limited and that he was only an ordinary member of the said Society and however, he had resigned from the membership of the Society on 7.2.2013, i.e., much prior to registration of the FIR. It is further submitted that allegations are against co-accused Ramesh Kumar, who is President of the Society and that he has also filed a suit for mandatory injunction against the present complainant which is still pending.

Notice of motion to Advocate General, Haryana, for Meenu 2014.01.28 17:23 I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document chandigarh CrI.M.No.M-43441 of 2013 (O&M) -2- 28.1.2014.

However, in the meantime, petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in case he is arrested, he shall be released on interim bail by the Arresting Officer to his satisfaction subject to compliance of conditions specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

It has been stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to the said order, the petitioner has already joined the investigation.

It has been stated by learned State counsel as well on instructions from ASI Kishan Dutt that the petitioner has joined the investigation and that he is no more required for any custodial interrogation by the police.

Bail application is not opposed.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that petitioner is likely to abscond or that he is likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

In view of these facts and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, order dated 19.12.2013, granting interim bail to petitioner-Punit Kumar is, hereby made absolute subject to the compliance of conditions contained in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly.

28.1.2014 (Ram Chand Gupta) meenu Judge Meenu 2014.01.28 17:23 I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document chandigarh

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com