

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

Date of Decision: 15.07.2019

1) CrI. Misc. No.M-2589 of 2019(O&M)

Vishal Sharma ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

2) CrI. Misc. No.M-44380 of 2018(O&M)

Vikram Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate for Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-2589 of 2019.
Mr. K.S. Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Dushyant Sarvesh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M no.44380 of 2018.
Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for respondent no.2 in CRM-M-2589 of 2019..

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel appearing for the parties in both the petitions
are *ad idem* that the matter has been compromised between the parties.
However, Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate, appearing for the petitioner in CRM-
M-2589 of 2019 (complainant in CRM-M-44380 of 2018), submits that
even while withdrawing the said petition seeking cancelation of bail granted
to respondent no.2 therein, i.e. Jitender @ Rinku, the petitioners' right to file
a similar petition be protected, if the terms of the compromise are not

honoured, as respondent no.2 has issued (in terms of the compromise), various cheques, with the last cheque to be presented to the bank in November, 2022.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual complicity of the petitioner in CRM-M-44380 of 2018, (i.e. Vikram Singh), or respondent no.2 in CRM-M-2589 of 2019, (i.e. Jitender @ Rinku), in the perpetuation of any crime as has been alleged in the FIR registered, as regards the petition seeking cancellation of bail, it is dismissed as withdrawn, with the aforesaid liberty granted.

As regards CRM-M-44380 of 2018, Mr. Sidhu, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is only the father of the prime accused (respondent no.2 in CRM-M-2589 of 2019) and therefore the matter in any case having been compromised, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Again without making any comment on the complicity of the petitioner, or otherwise, which would naturally be gone into by the investigating agency/competent court, the order dated 08.10.2018, admitting the petitioner to anticipatory bail, is made absolute, on the same terms and conditions.

Both the petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

15.07.2019
vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge
Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: no