

204

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

CRM-M-40179 of 2016

Date of decision: April 28, 2017

Satya Devi and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. J.S. Bawa, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG Punjab.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.170 dated 06.10.2016, under Sections 420, 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Rupnagar, District Rupnagar, the petitioners seek anticipatory bail. This Court had made an order dated 10.11.2016 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

In so far as petitioner No.1 is concerned, according to learned counsel for the rival parties, she being Sarpanch of the village and being a woman has granted the relief of anticipatory bail, subject to her furnishing solvent security with the trial Court in the sum of ₹5,000/- of her property till the completion of trial.

In so far as petitioner No.2 is concerned, I think that there is prima-facie, case against him. Not only that as pointed out by learned State counsel, there are large number of cases of similar nature against

petitioner No.2.

Statement is countered by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that against all, they have been compounded/compromised. Be that as it may, petitioner No.2 is not entitled to grant of anticipatory bail.

In that view of the matter, interim order dated 10.11.2016 granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail to petitioner No.1, is made absolute. However, said interim order dated 10.11.2016 stands vacated qua petitioner No.2.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

April 28, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No