

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

**CRM-M No.5834 of 2017
Date of Decision: 25.04.2017**

Vikram @ Pappu and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Ms. Bhawna Grewal, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in FIR No.16, dated 12.01.2017, registered under Sections 147, 149, 323, 325, 341 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Kanina, District Mahendergarh.

Vide order of this Court dated 22.02.2017, while issuing notice of motion, this Court had ordered that in the event of arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on ad-interim anticipatory bail, to the satisfaction of the Arresting officer subject to the conditions prescribed under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioners, learned counsel submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case; even if the contents of the FIR are taken as the gospel truth, which the petitioners do not admit, the allegations are non specific and vague; no specific injury is attributed to the petitioners; except under Section 506

IPC all offences are bailable; no recovery is to be effected from the petitioners and that under interim orders of this Court, the petitioners have not only joined investigation, they have fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Balwan Singh, admits that the petitioners have joined investigation; fully cooperated with the investigating agency and that at this stage, are no longer required for further questioning.

After considering the above submissions, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 22.02.2017 granting ad-interim bail anticipatory to the petitioners is made absolute, subject to the conditions prescribed under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

If the petitioners are found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail granted to them, it will be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the Competent Court/this Court for cancellation of the granted bail to the petitioners through this order.

April 25, 2017

rittu

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No