

104

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

CRM-M-4514 of 2017

Date of decision: February 14, 2017

Balraj Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

This is a petition for cancellation of regular bail granted by this Court to respondent No.2 vide order dated 18.10.2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the bail is required to be cancelled as there is, prima-facie, case against respondent No.2 who could not have been granted bail.

Upon hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, he was asked to answer the following reasons in the impugned order:-

“xxxx. I think, the evidence produced before me in the present case against the petitioner, prima-facie the evidence in the form of calls record does not show any such conspiracy or overt act on the part of the petitioner.xxxx.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner in response to above, submitted that there is recovery and therefore, bail granted to respondent No.2 is required to be cancelled. He, however, fairly stated that there is no direct evidence against respondent No.2.

Be that as it may, this Court had exercise discretion in granting bail for the reasons quoted above and there is no reason as to why bail should be cancelled.

Dismissed accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

February 14, 2017
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No