

(1)

CRM-M-31523-2016

Date of Decision : 18.10.2016

Ishwar and others

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-31647-2016

Date of Decision : 18.10.2016

Gaurav & others

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI**Present:** Mr. G.P.S. Bal, Advocate
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

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

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

This order will dispose of two petitions, one filed by Ishwar and others (CRM-M-31523-2016) and other by Gaurav and others (CRM-M-31647-2016) for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 428 dated 18.11.2014 registered at the instance of Inspector Anil Kumar alleging that the petitioners were members of unlawful assembly who

obstructed the complainant and other police officials to serve notice of the High Court upon Ram Pal in Satlok Aashram.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has already withdrawn the application on behalf of petitioners No. 6, 7 and 8 i.e. Jagdish, Satbir and Bijender in the bail application filed by Gaurav and others.

An argument has been raised by the learned State counsel that Basant Saini, petitioner No. 8 in the bail application filed by Ishwar and others, is involved in three other criminal cases.

Learned counsel for the petitioners at this stage withdraws the said petition *qua* Basant Saini, petitioner No.8.

I have considered the role of each of the remaining petitioners. Recoveries have already been effected. Challan has already been presented. Petitioners have been in custody with effect from 20.11.2014. Similarly circumstanced co-accused have been granted the concession of bail.

Both the petitions *qua* the other petitioners are allowed. Petitioners No.1 to 5 in CRM-M-31647-2016 namely, Gaurav, Santosh, Suresh, Umakant and Rambir and petitioners No.1 to 7 in CRM-M-31523-2016, namely, Ishwar, Raj Kumar, Suresh, Vijay Dass, Yoginder, Mukesh and Bijender are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court subject to the condition that they will not make any attempt to tamper with the evidence or hamper the further proceedings before the trial

Court in any manner.

Another direction is issued that these petitioners will not evade appearance before the trial Court with an objective to delay the proceedings *qua* the other accused.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

18.10.2016
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No