

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

CRM-M-24866-2016

Date of decision: September 14, 2016.

Dheeraj

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

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

Present: Shri Jangvir Singh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

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

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties; perused the impugned order and the reasons contained therein. This Court had granted ad-interim order on 25.7.2016. However, the learned State Counsel submits that this is the second offence committed by the petitioner by obstructing the Highway and thus putting the people at inconvenience. The reason for doing so, according to the prosecution, is that due to strike by the employees of the electricity board, the electricity was not available and therefore, the petitioner and others blocked the NH-2.

Be that as it may, this being the second offence committed by the petitioner, as can be seen from the impugned order, I think the petitioner should not given the benefit of anticipatory bail. In that view of the matter, reserving liberty in favour of the petitioner to apply for regular bail, this

petition is rejected. Interim order dated 25.7.2016 is vacated.

If the application for regular bail is filed, the same will be decided within one week from the date of its filing.

[A.B. Chaudhari]
Judge

September 14, 2016.
kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No