

Sr. No. 211

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

**CRM No. M-41778 of 2015
Date of Decision: 10.03.2016**

Chet Ram and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Smt.Mukesh and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Jagjot Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

None for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vivek Saini, DAG, Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA. J (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in complaint No.137 dated 21.05.2012, under Sections 294/323/506 read with 34 IPC and Section 3 of SC/ST Act, 1989.

While issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court on 24.12.2015:-

“ Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 438 read with Section 482, Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, Chet Ram and Gopal, who have been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 294, 323 and 506,

IPC, and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for brevity "SC and ST Act"), in a case arising out of FIR No.152 dated 07.06.2011, registered at Police Station, Hathin, District Palwal.

Learned proxy counsel submits that initially, the matter was reported to the police and the allegations were found to be false and thereafter, the respondent/informant filed a protest petition in which the petitioners have been summoned to face trial for the offences punishable under Sections 294, 323 and 506 read with Section 34, IPC, and Section 3 of the SC and ST Act.

Notice of motion for 10.03.2016.

In the meantime, on appearance of the petitioners before learned Summoning/trial Court they shall be admitted to ad interim bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to its satisfaction."

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners makes a categorical statement at the Bar that in pursuance to the notice of motion order passed by this Court, the petitioners had duly appeared before the summoning Court/trial Court and even admitted to interim bail on furnishing requisite bail bonds.

It may be noticed that even though the complainant, namely, Smt. Mukesh respondent No.1 is duly served yet no representation has been caused on her behalf to oppose the present petition.

In view of such statement made by counsel, the present petition is allowed. Order dated 24.12.2015, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Disposed of.

10.03.2016

vandana

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE