

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3635-2019

Date of decision: 29.04.2019

Reena Garg and another

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.3 dated 03.01.2019 under Sections 120-B & 379-A IPC, registered at Police Station Mehendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

While granting interim bail to the petitioners, following order was passed by this Court on 25.01.2019 :-

“It is, inter alia, contended that petitioner No.1 is the President of the Municipal Committee, Mahendergarh and petitioner No.2 is her husband and Municipal Councilor. On the date of the incident, the complainant came into the office of petitioner No.1 and started filming the proceedings. This was objected to and accordingly his mobile phone was confiscated. A report was made to the police and the confiscated mobile phone was handed over to it. The

present FIR is a counter-blast and is motivated.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioners have joined the investigation and are not required for any further investigation. It is further submitted that in fact, on account of political rivalry between two members of the Municipal Committee, the FIR has been registered against the petitioners and petitioner No.1 has even been suspended from the post on that account.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Ashok Kumar, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioners are no more required for any further investigation.

Learned counsel for complainant-respondent No.2 has however opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioners are involved in one more case/FIR of similar nature.

Considering the allegations in the FIR that petitioner No.1 has allegedly snatched the mobile phone of the complainant and the same has already been returned, while joining the investigation, I deem it appropriate to confirm the interim bail granted to the petitioners.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners vide order dated 25.01.2019 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

29.04.2019
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No