

209

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

**CRM-M No.7197 of 2017
Date of Decision: 27.04.2017**

VIRENDER AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present Mr. A.D.S. Jattana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioners seek grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.0463 dated 14.12.2015, registered under Sections 147/148/149/186/224/225/307/323/332/341/342/353/365/398 IPC at Police Station Hansi Sadar, District Hisar.

Allegations in the FIR are that the Gujarat Police headed by K.D. Rathore, PI GRP, Police Station Baroda raided the house of Surender son of Munshi. When the police reached village Sorki, the family members of the accused party along with other persons of the village attacked them and got the

accused released. Further allegations are that the accused party snatched mobile phone, gold chain, Identity Card and case file of the FIR from the police officials. Service revolver of HC Vijay Singh was also snatched and Vijay Singh was fired at his feet. The effort was made to fire at the complainant as well, but the complainant snatched the service revolver from the accused. The complainant was beaten up with fist blows. Rajinder, Lal Bhai and driver Manoj were forcefully made to alight from the vehicle and were locked in a room. The persons who attacked the police party were ultimately known by the names Munshi, Rajinder, Satbir, Pela, Poona @ Vinod, Karmbir, Rinku and Ramesh. Womenfolk of the accused party also participated in the occurrence.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Naurang Singh submitted that all the assailants except the petitioners have been granted bail. The complicity of the petitioner No.1 has not come forth in the FIR. No specific attribution has been shown *qua* petitioner No.2 as well. The petitioners could not be released on bail because of their antecedent behaviour in respect of past activities. It could not be disputed that the petitioners are on bail in other cases. Challan has already been presented.

At this stage, without adverting to the merits of the

case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioners on regular bail.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail, subject to their furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

April 27, 2017.

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No