

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

CRM-M-10627-2019

Date of decision:16.05.2019

SATTO @ SATYAWATI AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. G.S. Gopera, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana assisted by
HC Shiv Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.35 dated 1.2.2019 under Sections 34, 427, 452, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, Police Station Badali, Jhajjar.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Anoop Kumar wherein it has been alleged that on the day of occurrence when he was returning home from his shop on his bicycle and when he was on the '*Kacha*' ramp constructed in the street, then due to his carelessness his bicycle turn turtle and upon which his neighbour Satto wife of Krishan and her husband Krishan picked up quarrel with him and gave beatings to him. It is further alleged that later on they came to his house and damaged articles and again gave beatings to him and also threatened to eliminate him. It is further alleged that the complainant's wife went to the house of the accused and apologized but they did not accept the apology and

upon which the wife returned back home and consumed Camphor tablets. It is further stated therein that daughter and son-in-law of the accused also came there and also threatened to eliminate the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they have falsely been implicated in the present case and even as per the FIR the matter in fact is a petty dispute amongst neighbours which has been given a twist so as to falsely implicate the petitioners.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there are specific allegations in the FIR, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. Having considered rival contentions addressed before this Court and while bearing in mind the nature of the allegations and also that the petitioners are stated to have joined investigation, in my opinion, this case is not such which would warrant custodial interrogation. Accordingly the petition is accepted and the interim directions issued vide dated 8.3.2019 by this Court are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioners would appear before Investigating Officer as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

16.05.2019
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No