

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

CRM-M No.19838 of 2021
Date of Decision:-18th May, 2021.

Suman and anotherPetitioners.

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Jitender K. Sehrawat, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

Apprehending their arrest in the criminal case registered at Police Station Adampur, District Hisar vide FIR No.444 dated 12.11.2020 under Sections 147, 149, 323, 452, 506 IPC (later on the offence under Section 452 IPC has been deleted) with allegations of their having formed an unlawful assembly along-with their co-accused and having caused injuries to complainant Suresh as well as to his aunts Aneeshia and Shakuntla, both the accused-petitioners have joined hands to prefer the present petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who has joined the proceedings in this case in pursuance of the copy of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, accepts the notice accordingly.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel in the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that both the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and some of the co-accused of the present petitioners named Krishana wife of Rajender, Krishna wife of Rishal Singh and Chander Kala, have already been extended the benefit of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 30.04.2021 (Annexure P-4) and their another co-accused namely Sandeep son of Rajender has also been granted the same concession by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar vide order dated 23.04.2021 (Annexure P-3) and therefore, the petitioners also deserve the same relief on the ground of parity.

Per contra, learned State counsel argues that there are candid allegations against both the petitioners qua their having caused injuries to the complainant as well as his aunts, i.e. injured Shakuntla and Aneeshia and therefore, they are not entitled to the concession as prayed for in this petition.

Keeping in view the facts that the afore-named co-accused of the present petitioners have already been extended the relief of anticipatory bail vide orders Annexures P-3 and P-4 and that the offence under Section 452 IPC has also been subsequently dropped in the present case, as specifically mentioned in the order Annexure P-4 and without commenting upon the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed.

In the event of the arrest of the petitioners, they shall be admitted to bail subject to their furnishing the requisite bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer.

The petitioners shall join in the investigation as and when required to do so and shall also abide by all the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2), Cr.P.C.

May 18, 2021
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Note:	<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
	<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>