

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

Criminal Misc. No. M-22947 of 2016

Date of Decision:-26.07.2016

Mohinder Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

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

Present:- Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Petitioners have filed the second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.48 dated 8.4.2016, under Sections 353,186, 506, 148 and 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar, Sangrur.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that no allegations have been made against the petitioners which may deny them the benefit of anticipatory bail. As regard maintainability of second petition, learned counsel for the petitioners has referred **Ravinder Saxena vs. State of Rajasthan 2010(1) RCR (Criminal) 540.**

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

The earlier bail petition filed by the petitioners was dismissed as withdrawn on 19.5.2016 and in between no change in circumstances has been pointed out. Admittedly, the inquiry is pending in the case. So far as **Ravindra Saxena's** case (supra) is concerned, the same is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case as in that case the initial anticipatory bail application was filed before presentation of challan and, thereafter, second anticipatory bail application was filed after presentation of the challan. Therefore, that case is not helpful to the petitioners.

Accordingly, the second petition is dismissed.

July 26, 2016
Vijay Asija

(**HARI PAL VERMA**)
JUDGE