

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208)

CRM-M-13824 of 2020

Date of Decision: 16.06.2020

Satish and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

By this petition, the petitioners seek the concession of 'regular bail', upon FIR no.134 dated 11.03.2020 having been registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal, against them, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 323, 447, 506, 379B read with Section 34 of the IPC, with Section 201 of the IPC added subsequently.

Mr. Parminder Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the FIR is only a 'backlash' for the civil suit instituted by the petitioners' father (Ashok Kumar) against the complainant and others, such suit having been instituted in February 2020, seeking cancellation of a sale deed entered into between the parties; and therefore it is wholly a false FIR because even as per the injuries stated to have been received by the complainant party, there is no serious injury shown.

He further submits that though initially it was only stated in the

complaint that a gold chain was snatched from the complainant, Mohit, subsequently in the disclosure statement of petitioner no.1 (Satish), he is alleged to have stated that it was given by him to his mother who thereafter was also arraigned as an accused (though not arrested).

Learned State counsel however submits that the petitioners having been found to have attacked the complainant party and even having snatched the chain, they do not deserve the concession of bail. He however submits that there is no other criminal case registered against the petitioners and does not deny the fact that a civil suit has been instituted by the petitioners' father.

In view of the above, without making any comment on the merits of the case, for or against the petitioners, which would naturally be subject matter of the trial, as a report under Section 173 of the Cr.P.C. has already been submitted to the competent court, I deem it appropriate to admit the petitioners on bail during the pendency of the trial.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, for or against the petitioners, this petition is allowed. The petitioners would be enlarged on bail, upon their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

16.06.2020
Vcgarg/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No