

214

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

CRM-M-20649 of 2017

Date of decision: July 13, 2017

Parveen and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI****Present:** Mr. Amit Parashar, Advocate the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)**

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.264 dated 27.03.2017, under Sections 323, 506, 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ( for short' IPC') (Section 307 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad, the petitioners seek anticipatory bail. This Court had made an order dated 02.06.2017 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Assistant Sub Inspector Samraj Singh submits that the petitioners have joined investigation and custody is not required.

In that view of the matter, interim order dated 02.06.2017 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioners, is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

**(A.B. CHAUDHARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 13, 2017**

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No