

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

CRM No.M-10714 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 29, 2017

Naresh Kumar

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.M.K.Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. against State of Haryana and other respondents for quashing the impugned order dated 29.12.2016 vide which anticipatory bail was granted by the Courts below to respondent No.5 in case FIR No.565 dated 11.12.2016 under Section 148, 149, 323, 324, 332, 506, 353, 307, 379-B, 333, 201 IPC read with section 25 of the Arms Act and Section 3 of the SC/ST Act, order dated 07.01.2017 vide which anticipatory bail was granted by the Court to respondents No.6 to 9, order dated 09.01.2017 vide which application for cancellation of bail granted to respondent No.5 was dismissed and also the order dated 27.01.2017, vide which regular bail has been granted to respondents No.5 to 9.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that learned Addl. Sessions Judge,

Rewari vide detailed order dated 29.12.2016, copy of which is Annexure P-7, granted anticipatory bail to respondent No.5-Harish alias Tillu. It is in the order that till date investigating agency has not been able to get the medical opinion to show that two injuries found on the person of Gurdayal Singh are dangerous to life and it is stated that as on date, attraction of provisions of Section 307 IPC are debatable. The Court also held that prima facie offence under Section 3(1)(x) of the SC/ST Act is also not established and it is still debatable. A detailed order has been passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, while granting the anticipatory bail to respondent No.5-Harish alias Tillu. Similarly, vide impugned order dated 07.01.2017, the Court has granted anticipatory bail to Dharmabir, Sunil, Dharampal and Sanjeev @ Bablu by passing a detailed order.

The perusal of the impugned orders show that there is nothing on the record to show that these orders are illegal or not as per law. No ground is made out for setting aside these orders. Otherwise also, as argued, regular bails have already been granted to these respondents on the basis of earlier anticipatory bails by the Court. No illegality has been pointed out in the impugned orders.

In view of the above discussion, I find that the impugned orders are correct, as per law and do not require any interference from this Court.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

March 29, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No