

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

CRM-M-9465-2018

Date of Decision:17.04.2018

Ankesh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Akash Vashisth, Advocate for
 Mr.Sanjay Vashisth, Advocate,
 for the petitioners.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, D.A.G., Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel points to the fact that the role of petitioner no.1, Ankesh, is the same as has been attributed to Mahesh alias Manjeet and Sandeep alias Matru, in as much as Sandeep and Manjeet are alleged to have caught hold of the feet of deceased Mahesh, with petitioner no.1 having caught hold of his hands and taken him towards “Pirawali Johri.”

Even though both the petitioners in this petition as also the aforesaid Mahesh alias Manjeet and Sandeep alias Matru were all summoned upon an application filed under Section 319 Cr.P.C., this Court having already dismissed the application of similarly situated two persons, i.e. Mahesh and Sandeep aforesaid, I find no reason therefore to continue the interim order in favour of petitioner no.1 and consequently, this petition qua the said petitioner is dismissed.

As regards petitioner no.2, Sumit, he not having been attributed any specific role, but having been attributed the same role as those who have been admitted to anticipatory bail by this Court (all again summoned on an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C.), the petition is allowed and the order dated 07.03.2018 is made absolute qua petitioner no.2, Sumit.

It is made clear that nothing stated aforesaid will be taken as an observation for or against the petitioners on merits, but only in the context of the application seeking anticipatory bail.

Petition disposed of.

April 17, 2018

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	: YES/NO
Whether Reportable	: YES/NO