

215

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

CRM-M-31801 of 2019

Date of decision: September 25, 2019

Mukesh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, DAG Haryana.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr. P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioners, in FIR No.244 dated 02.07.2019, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 325, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal.

On 21.08.2019, while issuing notice of motion, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that present FIR is a counter-blast to the earlier FIR, lodged at the instance of the petitioners' side i.e. FIR No.229 dated 23.06.2019 (P-3), under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325 and 506, IPC, registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal.

Notice of motion for 25.09.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of their arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit them

to interim bail in the present case till the next date of hearing on their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioners are also directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Fateh Singh, has stated that in terms of order dated 21.08.2019, the petitioners have joined investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 21.08.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioners, is made absolute, subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off, accordingly.

However, it is made clear that the petitioners shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

September 25, 2019

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No