

203

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

**CRM-M-24956-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.11.2022**

Gulshan Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Rahul Vats, Advocate for
Mr. Aman Priye Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jagmohan S. Ghuman, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 by the Sessions Judge, Gurugram, vide order dated 09.05.2022, in FIR No.176 dated 18.04.2022 under Sections 279, 304(ii) IPC, registered at Police Station Khedki Daula, Gurugram, on furnishing bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. It was directed that the petitioner will abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the Sessions Judge has exceeded its

jurisdiction and has not noticed correct facts.

Except this, there is no other ground seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail.

On a Court query, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Bhim Singh and assisted by learned counsel for respondent No.2-accused, has submitted that the respondent-accused is regularly appearing before the trial Court. It is further submitted that there is no allegation or complaint given to the police authorities that respondent No.2 has either misused the concession of anticipatory bail or extended any threat to any witness or has failed to appear before the trial Court, which are standard grounds for cancellation of bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, going through the order dated 09.05.2022 passed by the Sessions Judge, Gurugram, finding that only ground taken in the present petition is that there are serious allegations in the FIR and the Sessions Judge has exceeded its jurisdiction, while granting anticipatory bail, is no ground to cancel the bail, as admittedly the Court of Sessions has powers to grant anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

10.11.2022
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No