

CRM-M-18797-2018

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

CRM-M-18797-2018

Date of Decision: 16.08.2018

Ravinder Yadav

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Ravinder Yadav has filed this petition under Section 439 (2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.2 and 3 vide order dated 16.11.2017 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, in FIR No.357 dated 12.10.2017, registered at Police Station PGIMS Rohtak, under Sections 307 and 34 IPC and Sections 25 and 30 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Respondents No.2 and 3 also appeared through their counsel and contested this petition.

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

CRM-M-18797-2018

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak has wrongly granted the benefit of regular bail to respondents No.2 and 3, Manjeet and Ashok in the aforesaid FIR ignoring nature and gravity of the offence.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 contested this petition stating that the impugned order is perfectly as per law and no illegality has been committed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak while granted regular bail to respondents No.2 and 3.

Perusal of record shows that though it is the case of prosecution that respondent No.2-Manjeet fired from a pistol, but it is a case of no injury. Nobody has been injured. Secondly, respondent No.3-Ashok is not stated to be armed with any weapon. Neither any injury nor any active participation has been attributed to respondent No.3.

Keeping in view the above facts, I find that the trial Court has rightly granted the benefit of regular bail to respondents No.2 and 3. No ground is made out to cancel the same.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

16.08.2018

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No