

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

(207)

CRM-M-24503-2016

Decided on: August 05, 2016.

Anil @ Surender

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-24905-2016

Decided on: August 05, 2016.

Nek Ram and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

(3)

CRM-M-26169-2016

Decided on: August 05, 2016.

Mukesh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

(4)

CRM-M-26292-2016

Decided on: August 05, 2016.

Roshan Lal and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-24503-2016.

Mr. Dharam Pal Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CRM-M-24905 and 26169 of 2016.

Mr. A.P.S. Mann, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CRM-M-26292-2016.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

This order will dispose of four applications for grant of regular bail, one (CRM-M-24503-2016) filed by Anil @ Surender, second (CRM-M-24905-2016) filed by Nek Ram and others, third (CRM-M-26169-2016) filed by Mukesh and others and the fourth (CRM-M-26292-2016) filed by Roshan Lal and others.

The petitioners in above said cases, are in custody since November, 2014. The FIR was registered on the allegations that the petitioners as members of unlawful assembly of 1500 to 2000 people carrying lathis, fire arm weapons and petrol bombs had obstructed the entry of the police officials in the Satlok Aashram for implementing the arrest warrants issued by the Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh. The petitioners are not involved in the murder case but there are allegations that they had either pelted stones or participated in the acts of assault.

With the assistance of State counsel and SI Satbir Singh, I have seen the role attributed to each of the petitioner. There are general allegations of having pelted stones.

Co-accused of the petitioners, similarly circumstanced, have already been granted concession of bail.

State counsel has opposed the applications for bail inter alia on the ground that the persons who had earlier been granted concession of bail, are making attempts to delay the proceedings by intentionally absenting on the dates of hearing.

The petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing individual personal bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court subject to the conditions that they will not absent themselves without any sufficient cause and will not obstruct the proceedings in any manner. In case of petitioners indulging in such activity, it will be open to the prosecution agency to seek cancellation of bail.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

August 05, 2016
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No