

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

CRM-M-15871-2022

Date of decision:13.07.2022

ABHIMANYU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present: Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner, by filing the present petition cast under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.63 of 05.03.2022, registered at Police Station Sadar Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, wherein offences constituted, under Sections 323, 325, 506, 34 of IPC, are embodied.
2. This Court, through an order made, on 20.04.2022 had granted *ad-interim* bail to the present bail petitioner.
3. The incriminatory role, as assigned to the present bail petitioner in the petition FIR, is that, his along with three other co-accused committing an assault, upon the person of the victim. The specific incriminatory role, as assigned to the present bail petitioner, is that, his with user of an iron pan causing fracture of the nasal bone of the victim.
4. However, it is stated, at the bar, by the learned State counsel, on instructions given to him, by ASI Birmati that, the recovery of the above incriminatory weapon of offence has been effected, by the present bail petitioner, to the investigating officer concerned, and, he also further submits

that, the victim has fully recuperated from the injuries, as become entailed, upon his person, by the present bail petitioner, and, other co-accused.

5. Given the above made statement, at the bar, by the learned State counsel, who also further submits that, the bail petitioner is also meteing all the other required co-operations, to the investigating officer concerned, thereupon this Court does not deem it fit, and, appropriate to order for the custodial interrogation of the present bail petitioner. Moreover, also when the prosecution, at this stage, has not adduced any evidence, suggestive that in the event of the bail petitioner being admitted to anticipatory bail, there is every likelihood of his fleeing from justice or tampering with prosecution evidence or influencing the prosecution witnesses.

6. In summa the order as made, by this Court, on 20.04.2022, is made absolute on the same terms and conditions, and, also subject to his furnishing personal, and, surety bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each, to the satisfaction of the arresting officer, and, also subject to his rendering co-operation to him, in the investigations to be carried into the offences mentioned in the present FIR. Moreover, also with an undertaking, that he shall not tamper with prosecution evidence, and, nor shall influence the prosecution witnesses.

7. Disposed of.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

13.07.2022

ithlesh

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No