

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

CRM-M-27569-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 03.11.2016

Naresh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Bijender Dhankhar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by HC Sandeep Kumar.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.190 dated 20.05.2016, under Sections 285, 338, 307 and 326 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at P.S. Kharkhoda, Distt. Sonapat.

Heard.

On 06.09.2016, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel contends that injury received by Purshotam was accidental which is duly reflected in the affidavit of complainant Dinesh and Purshotam-injured.

Notice of motion for 03.11.2016.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the Arresting Officer, he shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

1. That he shall make himself available for interrogation by a

police officer as and when required;

2.That he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and;

3.That he shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.

On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant-Dinesh, Son of Fateh Singh, resident of Village Farmana, Tehsil Kharkhoda, District Sonipat, Haryana and injured Purshotam son of Balbir Singh, resident of Village Farmana, Tehsil Kharkhoda, District Sonipat, Haryana are ordered to be impleaded as respondent Nos.2 and 3 at this stage.

Registry is directed to amend the memo of parties accordingly.

Fresh notice to newly added respondent Nos.2 and 3 be issued for the adjourned date.”

Respondent No.3, injured Purshotam, heard in person. He admits the factum of the compromise having been arrived at between the parties.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that in view of the compromise, he has no objection, in case, the instant petition is allowed.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 06.09.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate

concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

03.11.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No