

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

(I)

CRM-M-25162-2019
Date of Decision: 3.6.2019

ISRAIL AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(II)

CRM-M-24882-2019

HANSIRA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Farukh Abdullah, Advocate
for the petitioners in both petitions.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of the aforementioned petitions filed on behalf of Hansira, Israil and Altaf seeking anticipatory bail in respect of FIR registered against them vide FIR No.54 dated 7.3.2019 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 506 of the Indian Penal Code (Section 307 IPC added later on), Police Station Nagina,

District Nuh.

2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Deenu wherein it has been alleged that on 5.3.2019 there was an altercation between children of Muhar Khan & Usman and upon which Rassi wife of Muhar Khan complained to Dilshad. However Dilshad is alleged to have slapped Rassi and abused her. Later when complainant's brother went there then Usman, Subba, Hansaid, Amjad, Israil, Altaf, Dilshad, Hansira and 6-7 other persons came there armed with sticks. Usman who was carrying an iron rod gave a blow with the same on the head of complainant's brother, as a result of which blood oozed out of from his head. It is further alleged that Hansid and Amjad gave blows with sticks on the shoulder of complainant's brother. Dilshad, Altaf, Israil, Subba, Hansira etc. raised 'Lalkara' to kill them. All the accused are alleged to have given kicks and sticks blows.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they have falsely been implicated due to some misunderstanding which has now been resolved and that parties have now effected a compromise.
4. Mr. Afzal Hussain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed power of attorney, which is taken on record. He has endorsed the aforesaid assertions regarding compromise amongst the parties.
5. Although the learned State counsel has opposed the petitions while

submitting that since allegations pertaining to attempt to murder had been levelled, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and bearing in mind that it is a case of single injury with the blunt weapon and that parties are stated to have effected compromise, in my opinion, it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. The petitions as such, are accepted. In the event of arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation 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.
7. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be construed to be an expression on merits of the main case.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

3.6.2019
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No