

206-A

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

**Date of decision: September 25, 2017
CRM-M-18023 of 2017 (O&M)**

Simranjot Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-24495 of 2017

Neeraj Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. A.P. Batra, Advocate for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

By this common order, above said both the petitions are
being disposed of.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Petitioner(s) seek(s) anticipatory bail in FIR No.99 dated
26.07.2016, under Sections 302, 307, 452, 148, 149, 324 of Indian
Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Haibowal, District
Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

With the assistance of learned State counsel, I have
perused the statement recorded under Section 161 of Code of Criminal

Procedure, 1973. Though, the statements were recorded somewhat late after 5 months, the fact remains that the petitioner(s) having been named as accused persons of participating in the crime in question, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Petitions stand dismissed. Interim orders are vacated.

However, petitioner(s) can apply for regular bail.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

September 25, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No