

104

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

CRM-M-19600 of 2017

Date of decision: May 30, 2017

Prabhjeet Singh @ Rambo and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate the petitioners.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has cited the earlier order dated 05.05.2017 (Annexure P-3) and submitted that Tarsem Singh was granted regular bail and the petitioners would be entitled to grant anticipatory bail.

I am not inclined to accept the contention. I have seen the allegations against the petitioners. Overt act have been attributed to all the petitioners. It is true that Tarsem Singh was attributed the role of assaulting by means of *kirpan*, but then if the role of the petitioners is seen, it is clear that they have fully participated in the crime. The case of Tarsem Singh cannot be compared with the petitioners because he was granted regular bail against which the petitioners are claiming anticipatory bail, that too after the lapse of two years from the date of occurrence. In that view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, particularly looking to the

conduct of the petitioners.

In that view of the matter, this petition for anticipatory bail is rejected. Petition stands dismissed, accordingly. Liberty is granted to the petitioners to surrender and seek regular bail. If such application for regular bail is filed by the petitioners, the same shall be decided with 10 days from the date of its filing.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

May 30, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No