

209

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

CRM-M-19804 of 2016

Date of decision: August 22, 2016

Shyama and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Dr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Keshav Partap Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the interim order dated 02.06.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners have joined investigation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners had harvested the wheat crop which was sown by him.

The statement is seriously disputed by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that the dispute about the mutation is pending in Civil Suit No.374 of 2015 in the Court of Civil Judge (Junior Division), Assandh.

Learned counsel for the complainant states that for the last many time, petitioners have been in possession and have been sowing and

harvesting the crops.

In that view of the matter, it will be necessary to attach the condition to the order granting anticipatory bail.

Hence, interim order dated 02.06.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners, is made absolute. However, the petitioners are therefore, put a condition to furnish security in the sum of ₹5 lacs in the Civil Court in respect of the crops in question within a period of 10 weeks from today.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

August 22, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No