

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

**CRM-M-47547-2018
Date of decision: 18.12.2018**

Professor Revathy and another **...Petitioners**

Versus

State of Haryana and another **...Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. N. P. S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. D. D. Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail in criminal complaint No.54 of 2014 titled as '*Om Parkash Asija vs Thakur Hari Prasad Institute of Mentally Handicapped and others*' (Annexure P1).

On 26.10.2018, the following order was passed:

“Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in pursuance to the summoning order (Annexure P4) dated 12.03.2015, the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula and they were regularly attending the Court proceedings. It is further submitted that on 12.03.2018 on account of noting a wrong date, the petitioners could not appear before the trial Court and their bail/surety bonds were cancelled and non-bailable warrants were issued and even the proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C. was issued. It is also submitted that the petitioners are still ready to

appear before the trial Court and apply for fresh bail. Notice of motion for 18.12.2018. In the meantime, the petitioners are directed to appear before the trial Court on or before 30.10.2018 and the trial Court will release the petitioners on interim bail subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds and on payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- in the shape of demand draft in favour of the complainant – Om Parkash Asija.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, in pursuance to the order dated 26.10.2018, have already appeared before the trial Court and they have been released on interim bail after depositing the cost of Rs. 10,000/- as imposed by this Court.

Learned counsel for the complainant/respondent No. 2, on instructions from the complainant, who is present in Court, also submits that petitioners have appeared before the trial Court and have deposited the aforesaid cost.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Sangat Singh, could not dispute the factual position.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the order dated 26.10.2018, is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

December 18, 2018

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No