

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

CRM-M-22261-2016

Daya Ram and another

... **Petitioners**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

2.

CRM-M-26003-2016

Maina Devi and others

... **Petitioners**

v.

State of Haryana and others

... **Respondents**

Date of decision: August 24, 2016.

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

Present: Shri Arpandeeep Narula, Advocate for the petitioners
in CRM-M-22261-2016 and for respondents No.4 to 8 and 10
in CRM-M-26003-2016.

Shri V.S. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-26003-2016.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Both these petitions are being disposed of by the present
common order.

CRM-M-22261-2016 is for grant of anticipatory bail.

Petitioner No.2 Dalip @ Sarvan was arrested and therefore what remains in
this petition is the relief of anticipatory bail to petitioner No.1 Daya Ram.

The allegations against petitioner No.1 are that he had, with petitioner No.2,
assaulted the deceased Rajender, who ultimately died in the hospital after

seven days. Perusal of the FIR shows that there was a quarrel between the

neighbours as a result of which the incident took place. The police had registered the offences under Sections 323, 324, 506 IPC initially and after the death, converted the same to Sections 302/325 IPC. Looking to the role of petitioner No.1, I think the interim order regarding anticipatory bail should be confirmed.

However, at the same time, care will have to be taken to vouchsafe the interest of the prosecution. In this connection, there is a petition bearing CRM-M-26003-2016 filed by the widow of the deceased along with her two children seeking protection. Learned Counsel for the petitioners has agreed that respondents No.4 to 8 and 10 in this petition will not enter the place of residence of the complainant, i.e. Barsari, Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa and shall reside at village Anandgarh, District Sirsa and shall report to the Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta once in a month, i.e., last Sunday of each month between 4 to 6 p.m. Statement is accepted. I think the interest of the prosecution witnesses thus is well taken care of. Learned Counsel for petitioner No.1 as well as respondents No.4 to 8 and 10 shall not apply for modification of this condition.

Interim order dated 8.7.2016 is made absolute till the conclusion of trial in relation to petitioner No.1 Daya Ram.

Both the petitions stand disposed of accordingly.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

August 24, 2016.
kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No