

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

CRM-M-15244 of 2018
Date of Decision:21.05.2018

Gurpyas @ Guguu @ Actor and ors

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Dhirti Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Malik, DAG, Haryana.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.277 dated 01.10.2016 registered under Sections 323, 341, 365, 356, 307, 120-B and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Kalanwali, District Sirsa.

On 19.04.2018, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner could not appear on 6.3.2018 before

the learned trial Court on account of the fact that there was change of timings of the Court hours.

Notice of motion for 21.05.2018.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the proceedings before the learned trial Court. On doing so, he shall be released on interim bail by learned trial Court on his furnishing adequate bail bond/surety bond to its satisfaction.”

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that in terms of the order dated 19.04.2018, the petitioners have joined proceedings before learned trial Court.

On instructions from ASI Bhal Singh, the above factual position is duly acknowledged by learned State counsel.

In view of the above, the order dated 19.04.2018 is made absolute subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off.

However, it is directed that the petitioners shall not repeat the same lapse(s) in future and will fully co-operate with learned trial Court and shall not seek any unnecessary adjournments.

[MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU]
JUDGE

May 21, 2018
rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned	yes/no
Whether reportable?	yes/no