

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-6418 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.04.2016

Sunil @ Sunny

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Bhaskar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Doon, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate for
complainant/respondent no.2.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.319 dated 7.12.2015 under sections 323, 341, 506 I.P.C (offence under section 307 I.P.C was added later on), registered at Police Station, Purani Sabzi Mandi, Rohtak.

On 23.2.2016, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Counsel appearing for the petitioner would argue that even though offence under Section 307 IPC has been subsequently added yet a compromise between the parties has been entered into. It is contended that the present petitioner/accused as also the complainant/respondent No.2 are closely related and the compromise has been effected soon after the alleged occurrence and under such circumstances the compromise can be taken cognizance of.

Notice of motion, returnable for 29.04.2016.

At this stage, Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and submits that a compromise has in fact been arrived at between the parties.

In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and to join investigation.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and he shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel upon instructions from H.C Rakesh Kumar would apprise the Court that the petitioner has since joined investigation.

Counsel appearing for the complainant accepts that a compromise has been effected between the parties and does not oppose the present petition.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The order dated 23.2.2016, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Petition disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

29.04.2016
lucky