

CRM-M-46696-2017

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

101

**CRM-M-46696-2017 (O&M).
Decided on: February 9, 2018.**

Pritam

.. Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

*** * ***

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.S.BEDI

*** * ***

**PRESENT Mr.Jagjot Singh, Advocate, for
Mr.Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition, cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent Nos.2 to 5, vide order dated 4.5.2016, has been prayed for, claiming that they have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail subject to a condition that they would not repeat any act similar to the act committed in earlier FIR No.9 dated 5.1.2016, under Sections 147, 149, 323 and 506 IPC read with Sections 3 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, registered at Police Station, Hathin, District Palwal. It is argued that now FIR No.388, dated 9.10.2017, has been registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal, for allegedly committing offence under Sections 323, 506/34 IPC

CRM-M-46696-2017

read with Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

I have considered the contention of the counsel for the petitioner. The anticipatory bail was granted vide order dated 4.5.2016, subject to a condition that Kallu, Sappak, Yusuf and Arshad, will not indulge in similar activity in which they are involved in the case.

It has been informed by the counsel for the petitioner that after grant of anticipatory bail, the challan was presented and respondent Nos.2 to 5 have been granted the concession of regular bail. The anticipatory bail, at this stage, cannot be cancelled on account of the allegations as it is debatable at this stage whether the second FIR has been registered with an objective to defeat the rights of respondent Nos.2 to 5 or it is actually a case of assault by the respondent Nos.2 to 5 on the son of the petitioner.

In view of subsequent event of regular bail having been granted to respondent Nos.2 to 5, I do not find any ground to cancel the pre-arrest bail granted to respondent Nos.2 to 5, vide order dated 4.5.2016.

The present petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

February 9, 2018.
raj arora

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable:

Yes / No
Yes / No