

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

**CRM No.M-6326 of 2017 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: April 21, 2017**

Shokeen

...Petitioner

**VERSUS**

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr.Gautam Dutt, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr.B.S.Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Mohd. Arshad, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.258 dated 18.07.2015 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 307, 506, 395, 397, 440 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Tauru, District Nuh.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record

As per the FIR, petitioner Shokeen was not armed with any weapon and was found innocent by the police during investigation and it is

argued that he has not caused any injury. There are about 75 accused in the FIR and it is also stated that there are 21 injured.

The present petitioner is also stated to have been declared as Proclaimed Offender on 18.02.2017 but on that day, the present petition for anticipatory bail has been drafted by the counsel for filing the same before this Court. Furthermore, it is argued that learned trial Court has also granted anticipatory bail to so many proclaimed persons.

The petitioner has already joined the investigation. He is not required for any investigation or interrogation purposes. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioner to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioners are entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the present petition is accepted and the order dated 28.02.2017 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute.

**April 21, 2017**  
Vgulati

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

**Yes**  
**No**