

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2576-2017

Date of decision : 06.03.2017

Naveen and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajender Singh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Kuldip Tiwari, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Upon notice issued, learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioners were actually summoned by the trial Court upon an application having been moved under Section 319 Cr.P.C. by the prosecution and as such, their custodial interrogation is not required.

It is seen that the trial Court has rejected the bail application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. only on the ground that a specific role has been attributed to the petitioners in the FIR, to the effect that petitioner no.1 caught hold of the legs of the father in-law of the complainant and petitioner no.2 gave a *lathi* blow on the right hand and left forearm of the complainants' father in-law.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, as also the fact that the petitioners have been summoned only an application filed under Section 319 Cr.P.C., without making any comment on the merits of the allegations

made against the petitioners, the petitioners on appearance before the trial Court are directed to be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of that Court.

Disposed of.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

March 06, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No