

CRM-M-16726-2021

Date of Decision:30.07.2021

Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CRM-M-16727-2021

Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGHPresent: Mr. Jai Parkash Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard by video conference.

Vide CRM-M-16726-2021, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'regular bail' under the provisions of Section 439 Cr.P.C., upon FIR No.33, dated 21.01.2021, having been registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 506/307 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act. Vide CRM-M-16727-2021, he is seeking the same relief also in the context of FIR No.34, dated 21.01.2021, registered at the same police station, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 258/307 of the IPC and Sections 27/54/59 of the Arms Act.

The background of the matter is that the petitioner is stated to have fired shots at both, his father and at his wife, at his wifes' parents house, resulting in registration of the two FIRs in question.

Vide an order dated July 15, 2021, the complainants in both the

FIRs, i.e. the father and the wife of the petitioner, had been impleaded as respondent no.2 in each petition respectively, with liberty granted to them to appear the learned Area Magistrate concerned to record their statements in respect of any compromise reached by either of them with the petitioner.

Pursuant thereto a report has been received from the learned JMIC, Kurukshetra, dated July 20, 2021, stating to the effect that the complainants in each FIR, i.e Reena Devi and Shamsheer Singh (in FIRs no.33 and 34, both dated 21.01.2021 respectively), appeared before that court and stated that they have entered into a compromise with the petitioner and as per the assessment of that court, the compromise effected is valid and genuine.

That being so, though serious offences are alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, with thereby the provisions of Sections 307 of the IPC having been invoked in each FIR, yet looking at the fact that the complainant in each FIR is the petitioners' father and his wife, who have recorded their statements as above, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, the petitions are allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail in the context of each of the two FIRs, upon him furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds in respect of each case, to the satisfaction of the trial court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

July 30, 2021

dharamvir/

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO

Whether Reportable : YES/NO