

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

**Sr. No.103**

**CRM-M-10765 of 2022**

**Date of Decision: 14.03.2022**

Vijay @ Baje and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANT PARKASH**

Present: Mr.Prabhjeet Singh Sullar, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*

**SANT PARKASH, J. (ORAL)**

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.73 dated 23.02.2022, registered under Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, Sections 323, 342, 386 and 506 IPC at P.S.Julana, District Jind.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a civil dispute was given the colour of criminal proceedings by present FIR and now, the said dispute has been settled vide Memorandum of Understanding dated 04.03.2022 (Annexure P-2) executed by the complainant vide which the parties have resolved the matter between themselves and the complainant does not want to pursue the present FIR.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Amreek Singh Narwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Mr. Shashikant Gupta, Advocate put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant by filing memo of appearance, which is taken on record and admits the factum of compromise having been effected between the parties.

In view of the aforesaid fact that the parties have compromised the matter between themselves, the present petition is allowed and the petitioners are admitted to concession of anticipatory bail.

However, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required and in the event of arrest, petitioners shall be released on pre-arrest bail at the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer subject to the following conditions, as envisaged under section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

- (i) *that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- (ii) *that the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) *that the petitioners shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.*

**(SANT PARKASH)  
JUDGE**

14.03.2022  
Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No