

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

**(1) CRM No.M-18855 of 2016 (O&M)**

Jagiro Devi  
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
...Respondent

**(2) CRM No.M-19774 of 2016 (O&M)**

Karam Singh  
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
...Respondent

**(3) CRM No.M-19775 of 2016 (O&M)**

Smt.Shalu alias Shiksha and another  
...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana  
...Respondent

**(4) CRM No.M-19824 of 2016 (O&M)**

Rupinder Singh  
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
...Respondent

**(5) CRM No.M-20135 of 2016 (O&M)**

Balwant Singh  
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr.Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr.Vikramjit Singh, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

All the above-mentioned cases are taken up together being arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.55 dated 28.03.2016 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 325, 341, 307 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Chhachhrauli, District Yamuna Nagar.

Notice of motion was issued in all the cases. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Rajbir Singh complainant. As per the prosecution version, petitioner Karam Singh was armed with lathi and he gave simple injuries to complainant and Ram Kumar. No role of petitioner Shalu has been alleged but only fist blows have been attributed to her. Petitioner Hakam Singh was armed with gandasi and gave simple injuries to complainant and Rajbir. Petitioner Balwant Singh was stated to be armed with danda and he gave danda blow to Angrezo. Fist blow has been

to be empty handed and no injury has been attributed to her.

The petitioners have already joined the investigation. It is the case of version and cross-version. Even the petitioners' side has also received injuries. It is yet to be determined as to who is the aggressor party. The petitioners are not required for custodial interrogation. They have not caused injuries dangerous to life. The non-applicant main accused has caused the injuries dangerous to life. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioners are entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, all the petitions are accepted and the order dated 27.05.2016 (passed in CRM No.M-18855 of 2016), orders dated 02.06.2016 (passed in CRMs No.M-19774, 19775 and 19824 of 2016) and order dated 03.06.2016 (passed in CRM No.M-20135 of 2016) granting interim bail to the petitioners, are made absolute.

**August 16, 2016**  
Vgulati

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

**Yes**

Whether reportable

**No**