

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

CRM-M-29086-2016

Date of decision: September 26, 2016.

Harish alias Harinder

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

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

Present: Shri Sat Narain Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Chetan Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

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

Heard Learned Counsel for the rival parties. Learned Counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that in para 7 of the impugned order made by the trial Judge, there is a reference that the revolver was required to be recovered whereas, as a matter of fact, the revolver already stood deposited with the police. Learned Counsel for the petitioner then argued that the FIR was falsely lodged by the SDO only because of the employees making complaint against the petitioner.

I have seen the reasons given by the learned trial Judge in the impugned order made by him. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the order made by the trial Judge indicate the facts as well as the offences allegedly committed by the petitioner. The perusal of the above paragraphs clearly shows that the petitioner had attempted to switch on the electricity supply and as a result

the lives of the persons who were repairing the fault at the top of the electric pole could be seriously endangered. The petitioner cannot be granted the relief of anticipatory bail in such a situation. The act on the part of the petitioner was very dangerous. In that view of the matter, the petition is dismissed. Interim order is accordingly vacated.

September 26, 2016.
kadyan

[**A.B. Chaudhari**]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No