

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.19641 OF 2016
Date of Decision.17.06.2016

Payal Kinner and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Manoj Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Siddharth Sanwaria, DAG, Haryana.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The counsel for the petitioners contends that the complainant had earlier filed CRM-M No.14013 of 2016 levelling the allegations as in the present FIR against another set of persons namely Mahipal Dhanak, Pawan, Jyoti, Sunil and Koyal. The said petition was disposed of with the direction to the complainant to take available remedy under the law. It is a conceded position on record that the FIR lodged against the petitioners was one and half months old. The complainant was admitted in the hospital on 13.04.2016 and the FIR was lodged on 06.05.2016.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper and of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required.

In the event of arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions

contained in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C and they will join the investigation as and when required.

The crl. misc. petition is disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

June 17, 2016
Pankaj*