

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

215

**CRM-M- No.33408 of 2016
DATE OF DECISION: 15.11.2016.**

Purshotam and another

...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.

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

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

I have gone through the allegations against the petitioners in a case which was registered at the instance of Inspector Anil Kumar to the effect that main accused Rampal had made a shield of about 600/700 ladies and children in front of his Satlok Ashram to prohibit the entrance of the complainant and other police officials for execution of his arrest warrant. Gun of Ombir and of Nayab had been used by petitioners No.1 and 2 respectively. Petitioners have made disclosure statements in this regard.

State counsel has intervened to oppose the application for bail on the ground that the petitioners are involved in other case under Section 302 IPC. However, counsel for petitioners has instructions to say that petitioner No.1 has been released on bail in the other case.

Without expression of any opinion on merits, it is sufficient to observe that co-accused of the petitioner have been granted concession of bail by this Court. On the principle of parity, the petitioners can also be

granted the same relief.

The petition is allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court subject to the condition that petitioners will not absent themselves during the entire period of trial and will not hamper the proceedings in any manner. In case of any such event, the bail granted to the petitioners will be liable to be cancelled.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

15.11.2016.

komal

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