

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

211

CRM-M-12512 of 2017

Date of Decision: April 25, 2017

Wahid

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in F.I.R. No.114 dated 05.03.2017 under sections 148, 149, 323 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal.

On 11.04.2017, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 114, dated 05.03.2017, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is 67 years old and has been attributed only one injury on the left hand, which is simple in nature and caused by blunt weapon.

Issue notice to respondent.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Let a complete set of paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during the course of the day.

List on 25.04.2017.

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

In the event of his arrest, the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on ad-interim bail subject to his/her satisfaction. 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 ASI Sunder Singh would apprise the Court that the petitioner has since joined investigation. The observations made by this Court in the order dated 11.04.2017 have gone un-rebutted.

Under such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner, as such, would not be warranted.

Prayer made in the present petition is accepted.

Accordingly, the order dated 11.04.2017, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Petition disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

25.04.2017
anju rani

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