

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

CRM-M-6435-2016

Date of decision: November 29, 2016.

Parveen @ Peena

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Haryana

... **Respondent**

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

Present: Shri Rajbir Sehrawat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

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

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties. In FIR No.612 dated 12.12.2015, under Sections 342, 367, 386, 506 IPC, PS Sadar Sonapat, District Sonapat, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail. By order dated 23.2.2016, this Court had made observations prima facie about the role attributed to the petitioner. Thereafter, vide order dated 3.10.2016, the State Counsel was asked to find out whether offences of similar nature were pending against the petitioner. Learned Counsel for the State makes a statement that one FIR under Section 448, 506 IPC is registered against the petitioner. It is clear that the said offence is not of similar nature. There is no other offence of similar nature registered against the petitioner. In that view of the matter, in my opinion, the interim order granted to the petitioner on 23.2.2016 is required to be confirmed. Hence, order dated 23.2.2016 is made absolute.

Disposed of.

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

November 29, 2016.

kadyan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No