

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-18249 of 2017

Date of Decision: May 30, 2017

Deepak

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ashok Kaushik Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG., Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the complainant.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (ORAL)

Though learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Vinod, submits that the petitioner has joined investigation, he further submits that the recovery of the weapon of offence has not been made, as the petitioner has not produced the same.

Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates what he had submitted on the last date of hearing, to the effect that the person who was allegedly shot by the petitioner, i.e. respondent No.3, Mahavir, made a statement that infact it was not the petitioner but Jitender, the complainant (respondent No.2 herein), who had shot him. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that a subsequent FIR was also got registered by respondent No.3 against respondent No.2 and others, alleging that he had been shot by respondent No.2, but a cancellation report has been filed in the

said FIR, which learned State counsel again on instructions does not deny.

Having considered the aforesaid argument, this being a petition seeking anticipatory bail, with the person alleged to have been shot making a statement that he was not shot by the petitioner but by Jatinder, the order dated 22.5.2017, granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

The petition is disposed of accordingly.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

May 30, 2017
archana

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/no
Whether reportable: Yes/no